



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
World Council of Churches

THE THIRD WORLD
CONFERENCE ON
FAITH AND
ORDER

280.233
T 595 t
cop. 1

THE THIRD WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER

HELD AT LUND
August 15th to 28th, 1952

*

Edited by
OLIVER S. TOMKINS, D.D.
*Chairman of Working Committee
Faith and Order Commission*

Stratford, 1908-

WCC Library
Ecumenical Institute
Château de Bossey
Ch. Chenevière 2
CH-1279 Bogis-Bossey

SCM PRESS LTD
56 BLOOMSBURY STREET
LONDON

LIBRARY
World Council of Churches
17, route de Malagnou, GENEVA

THE THIRD WORLD
CONFERENCE ON
FAITH AND
ORDER

EDITED BY

FRANCIS AND JANE YERGEN

OLIVER & TOWERS

First published 1953

*Printed in Great Britain by
The Camelot Press Ltd., London and Southampton*

CONTENTS

★

<i>Preface</i>	7
----------------	---

PART ONE

THE REPORT TO THE CHURCHES

Preface	II
I. A Word to the Churches	15
II. Christ and His Church	17
III. Continuity and Unity	23
IV. Ways of Worship	39
V. Intercommunion	49
VI. Where do we stand?	60

PART TWO

FROM EDINBURGH TO LUND (1937-53)

I. 1937-9	69
II. 1939-45	71
III. 1945-8	72
IV. 1948-52	76

PART THREE

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE

Chapter

1. The Opening Service	83
2. The Conference Opens and Surveys its Task	95
3. The Temple of the Lord	139
4. The Task of Faith and Order in a Pilgrim Church	151
5. The Social and Cultural Factors in Church Divisions	174

6. The World Mission of the Church	204
7. First Fruits of Common Work	225
8. A Day of Refreshment and Worship	287
9. Harvest	295

APPENDICES

1. Time-Table and Daily Programme of the Conference	321
2. List of Delegates and all other Participants	326
3. Distribution of the Conference into Sections	338
4. Conference Committees (including Report of Press Committee)	348
5. Analysis of Conference into Confessions, Geographical Areas and Categories	357
6. The Constitution of the Faith and Order Commission	359
7. Members of the Faith and Order Commission	366

<i>Indexes</i>	373
----------------	-----

PREFACE



This volume is the successor to *Lausanne 1927*, edited by the late Canon H. N. Bate, and *Edinburgh 1937*, edited by Dr. Leonard Hodgson. Now the proceedings of the Third World Conference on Faith and Order are offered in some detail to all who seek the unity of the People of God and who believe that these conferences are of some significance to that end.

Each editor followed his own devices in the arrangement of the material, but in every case the aim has been to show something of the process by which the final Report was reached and to leave a permanent record of the discussions that led to the conclusions accepted by the Conference as a whole. Unlike my predecessors, I have begun by printing first the final report and then, by the use of what cinema producers would call 'flash-backs', I have tried to show how the opening scene was created. Since the Report was the end of the process chronologically, its position in this volume is only justified because it was, logically, the end in the sense of *telos*. As such, it is the part of the book most likely to be needed for reference and so should be the easiest to find. Part II sets the stage by recapitulating briefly the developments in Faith and Order work which bridged the gap from Edinburgh to Lund. The third, and longest, part seeks to convey the developing story of the Conference itself, partly by description but chiefly by reporting, *in extenso*, or in summary, the principal contributions which were made.

I ask the forgiveness of any who find that the sense of their contributions to the discussion has been misrepresented. It was not always easy to recapture from notes, however careful, exactly the impression conveyed some months earlier, even if correctly understood at the time. Space forbids even the summarising of all utterances and again I can only ask the forgiveness of those who felt that their remarks deserved, but have not received, any record here. For all these sins, of commission and omission, I accept the blame.

But the whole task would have been impossible without the help of more friends than can be named. Dr. Floyd Tomkins helped me, as he helped Dr. Hodgson, with meticulous care over the statistical sections. Above all, I am indebted to my secretary, Miss Margaret Rhodes, who came to my rescue as I tried to carry out this task over the period when I was winding up an old job and learning a new one. That the volume was finally ready for the publisher even within one year of the Conference is due to her energy and care over many months. The S.C.M. Press, especially in the person of Miss Kathleen Downham, have given all the courtesy and encouragement which a publisher could possibly give.

As I finally hand over to another, Dr. Robert Nelson, the Secretaryship of the Faith and Order Commission, I dedicate this, my last secretarial duty, to all those whose loving co-operation makes the work of Faith and Order itself an experience of unity in Christ.

OLIVER TOMKINS

*The Theological College,
Lincoln
August 1953*

Part One

THE REPORT TO
THE CHURCHES

THE REPORT TO THE CHURCHES

PREFACE



Since 1939 Theological Commissions have been preparing material for discussion by this Conference. The Conference itself was called in order that the work of these groups of theologians could be laid before a body more fully representative of the Churches. Their three Reports, entitled *The Church*, *Ways of Worship*, and *Intercommunion*, were sent in advance to all the delegates, many of whom had also read one or more of the three volumes of essays contributed in the course of this preparatory work. The report now issued is the result of some ten days spent in the discussion of this material by 220 delegates appointed for the purpose by their Churches.

We are deeply conscious that no gathering of such a size, in such a brief period of time, could give to the subjects before us such patient and thorough study as they had received from the Commissions which produced these preparatory Reports. We have tried honestly to record the agreements and disagreements which have emerged in the course of our discussion of them. We hope that those who read what we have to say will find in this Report a pointer to the further study of those other Reports and volumes.

By our constitution (Article 4) we are a Conference of Churches 'in which none is to be asked to be disloyal to or to compromise its convictions, but to seek to explain them to others while seeking to understand their points of view. Irreconcilable differences are to be recorded as honestly as agreements.' Our work is 'not to formulate schemes and tell the Churches what they ought to do, but to act as the handmaid of the Churches in the preparatory work of clearing away misunderstandings, discussing

obstacles to reunion, and issuing reports which are submitted to the Churches for their consideration'. This has called for great self-restraint on the part of those of us who, in this direction or that, would have liked to see more positive recommendations to action. But where such recommendations would present to any Churches a choice between disloyalty to their convictions and a withdrawal from ecumenical fellowship in discussion, they would do more harm than good.

Nevertheless, we feel that in this Conference we have ourselves gained much, and can issue a Report which bears witness to an advance upon what has gone before. At Lausanne in 1927 and at Edinburgh in 1937 it was impossible directly to approach the fundamentally important subject of the nature of the Church. Too many more immediately obvious differences surrounded that central theme, demanding much in the way of mutual explanation. Here at Lund we have met in a spirit of mutual trust and confidence which has enabled us to find fellowship in exploring together the deepest and most controversial issues. We go back to our Churches as men who have entered into a rich experience of deeper understanding of one another. We go back to bring that deeper understanding to those whom we represent, and in this Report, as we speak of the Church, of Ways of Worship, and of Intercommunion, we speak of issues deeper and more controversial than have been so spoken of before.

In two ways in particular these pages make an advance on previous Faith and Order Conference Reports:

(i) Its second chapter does not record agreements and disagreements on subjects at present dividing the Churches, but seeks to initiate a theological study of the biblical teaching about the relation between Christ and the Church. We have had no time to do more than make the first approach, but we believe that this first attempt to pass beyond the consideration of our immediately apparent disagreements and to explore the underlying theological problem provides a fitting introduction to the rest of the Report, and opens up fertile lines of further study both by the World Council's continuing Commission on Faith and Order and in the Churches themselves.

(ii) The bearing on the problem of unity of social, cultural, political, racial and other so-called 'non-theological' factors was hardly as much as mentioned at Lausanne in 1927. At Edinburgh

in 1937 some attention was paid to it in one section of the Conference. Since then there has been an increasing realisation of its importance, and as part of the preparation for this Conference a group was convened to consider it at the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, Switzerland, in November 1951. Its Report, *Social and Cultural Factors in Church Divisions*, was not assigned to any particular section of our Conference, but its influence was felt throughout, as may be seen especially in Chapters III, IV and VI. Together with the documents mentioned above we would commend to the Churches the further study of this Report.

One other document that we have had before us is *Towards Church Union, 1937-1952*. This survey of approaches to closer union among the Churches, compiled by Bishop Stephen Neill, describes unions achieved and negotiations entered into by Churches since the Edinburgh Conference. It is a factual record, which was given to us for information, not for discussion. It tells of much for which we have to thank God, much from which we have drawn encouragement in our work. We submit our own Report to the Churches in the hope that what we have done together here may be used by God to make possible the writing of further chapters in this story according to His will.

THE REPORT

AS SUBMITTED FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF
THE PARTICIPATING CHURCHES

I

A WORD TO THE CHURCHES



(*Note:* This section was released for publication immediately after its adoption by the Conference, as being a short message to the Churches, pending their reception of the remainder of the Report.)

We have been sent to Lund by our Churches to study together what measure of unity in matters of faith, church order and worship exists among our Churches and how we may move towards the fuller unity God wills for us. We give thanks to the Lord of the Church for what He has wrought among us in and through our fellowship of conversation and prayer and for evidences that in several parts of the world Churches are drawing closer together. We have made many discoveries about one another's Churches and our perplexity in the face of unresolved differences has been surpassed by our gratitude for the manifold grace of God which we see at work in the life of the Churches all over the world.

We have seen clearly that we can make no real advance towards unity if we only compare our several conceptions of the nature of the Church and the traditions in which they are embodied. But once again it has been proved true that as we seek to draw closer to Christ we come closer to one another. We need, therefore, to penetrate behind our divisions to a deeper and richer understanding of the mystery of the God-given union of Christ with His Church. We need increasingly to realise that the separate histories of our Churches find their full meaning only if seen in the perspective of God's dealings with His *whole* people.

We have now reached a crucial point in our ecumenical discussions. As we have come to know one another better our eyes

have been opened to the depth and pain of our separations and also to our fundamental unity. The measure of unity which it has been given to the Churches to experience together must now find clearer manifestation. A faith in the one Church of Christ which is not implemented by *acts* of obedience is dead. There are truths about the nature of God and His Church which will remain for ever closed to us unless we act together in obedience to the unity which is already ours. We would, therefore, earnestly request our Churches to consider whether they are doing all they ought to do to manifest the oneness of the people of God. Should not our Churches ask themselves whether they are showing sufficient eagerness to enter into conversation with other Churches, and whether they should not act together in all matters except those in which deep differences of conviction compel them to act separately? Should they not acknowledge the fact that they often allow themselves to be separated from each other by secular forces and influences instead of witnessing together to the sole Lordship of Christ who gathers His people out of all nations, races and tongues?

Obedience to God demands also that the Churches seek unity in their mission to the world. We share the failure to convey the Christian message to the mass of mankind. But it is precisely to these masses that we have the obligation to preach the one Gospel, and to manifest the oneness of the Church.

The word penitence has been often on our lips here at Lund. Penitence involves willingness to endure judgment—the judgment of the Lord to whom has been given the power to sift mankind and to gather into one the scattered children of God. We await His final triumph at the end of history. But, in God's mercy, tokens of judgment which are also calls to a new and active obedience come to us in our day also, here and now. Surely we cannot any longer remain blind to the signs of our times and deaf to His Word.

The Lord says once again: 'He that gathereth not with me, scattereth'.

II

CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH



We believe in Jesus Christ our Lord, who loved the Church and gave Himself for it, and has brought the Church into an abiding union with Himself. Because we believe in Jesus Christ we believe also in the Church as the Body of Christ.

I

We confess that without Christ we are lost, and without Him we are subject to the powers of sin and death, but that God has not abandoned us to the powers of destruction. He has given to us and all men His only begotten Son as Saviour and Redeemer. Through His life, His suffering, His death and His resurrection Jesus Christ as the mighty Victor has overcome sin and death, brought the ungodly powers to nought, and has given us freedom. When we believe in Jesus Christ these powers can no longer exercise lordship over us. Thus we stand under a new Lord. It is Jesus Christ who is our Lord.

For He, in His incarnation, death and resurrection, has entered into oneness with man in his estrangement and in his existence under the judgment of God, and by making atonement for man's guilt has consecrated a new way in which man, reconciled with God, may live in union with Jesus Christ. Through Him God has given to lost humanity a new beginning, for in that Jesus Christ died and rose again, all who believe in Him die and rise again to a new life.

Jesus Christ is the King of the new People of God. He is 'the chief cornerstone in which the whole building, fitly framed together, grows up into a holy temple in the Lord'. He is the head of the Church which is His Body. Through His Spirit Jesus Christ Himself is present in His Church. Christ lives in His Church and the Church lives in Christ. Christ is never without

His Church; the Church is never without Christ. Both belong inseparably together, the King and His people, the keystone and the temple, the Head and the Body. As members of His Body we are made one with Him in the fellowship of His life, death and resurrection, of His suffering and His glory. For what concerns Christ concerns His Body also. What has happened to Christ uniquely in His once-and-for-all death and resurrection on our behalf, happens also to the Church in its way as His Body. As the Church is made a partaker in the crucified Body of Christ, so also it is given to be partaker in the risen Body of the same Lord. This means that the Church is called to continue the mission of Jesus Christ to the world, so that the way of Christ is the way of His Church.

II

On the ground of the apostolic witness to Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Church, and in obedience to Him, we seek to penetrate behind the divisions of the Church on earth to our common faith in the one Lord. From the unity of Christ we seek to understand the unity of the Church on earth, and from the unity of Christ and His Body we seek a means of realising that unity in the actual state of our divisions on earth.

We believe that many of our differences arise from a false antithesis between the Church's being in Christ and its mission in the world, and from a failure to understand the Church in the light of Jesus Christ as God and man, and in the light of His death and resurrection. In the following paragraphs we seek:

(1) to speak of the nature of the Church in terms of a double movement (its being called from the world and its being sent into the world) through which it is ever being built up into Jesus Christ its Head;

(2) to speak of the Church as the new creation, which, while it continues to live on earth as a community of forgiven sinners, expecting the redemption of the body, is already given to participate in the new life of the risen Christ.

The Faith of the Church in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit

In His eternal love the Father has sent His Son to redeem creation from sin and death. In Jesus Christ, God's Son became Man. By word and deed He proclaimed on earth the arrival of God's

kingdom, bore away the sins of the world on the Cross, rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, to the throne of His kingdom, at the right hand of God. At Pentecost God poured out His Spirit upon the Church, giving all who believe in Jesus Christ the power to become God's children. Through the indwelling of His Spirit Jesus Christ dwells in the midst of His Church. As Lord and King He will come again to judge the quick and the dead and to consummate the eternal kingdom of God in the whole creation.

The Nature and Mission of the Church

(a) The Lord Jesus Christ, through His Word and Spirit, calls His Church from the world. He forgives sins, delivers men from the lordship of the powers of destruction and gathers out of this broken world the one People of God, the community of the justified and sanctified whose citizenship is in heaven and whose life is hid with Christ in God.

(b) Jesus Christ through His Word and Spirit sends His Church into the world to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world. That is, as Prophet, Priest and King He gives His Church to participate in His ministry of reconciliation, constraining it by His love to enter into His passion for the redemption of the world, and empowering it by His Spirit to proclaim the Gospel of salvation to all nations, calling them to obey the will of God in all the areas of political and social and cultural life and to live out in the divisions of the world the life of the one People of God, so that through its witness Jesus Christ is at work among men as Saviour, and brings all things in subjection under Himself as Lord and King of the world.

(c) By calling and sending His People, by granting them manifold spiritual gifts for the ministry, Jesus Christ builds up His Church as the living Temple of God. Thus the Church as the Body of Christ 'grows up into him in all things who is the head, from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth according to the effective working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love'.

The Church between the First and the Final Coming of Christ

(a) At the same time the Church is a community of forgiven sinners eagerly expecting and patiently watching for the final

consummation of its redemption. It continues to be a pilgrim people in a strange land, so that all its life and work on earth is incomplete. Ungodly powers and forces are still rampant in the whole creation in an alarming way, and they seek to confuse the Church and defeat its mission. But the Church continues to live and work by the power of Jesus Christ.

(b) At the end of its pilgrimage Jesus Christ, the Crucified and Risen, will come again to meet His Church in order to complete His work of redemption and judgment. Out of all peoples and ages He will gather His own who look for His appearing and for a new heaven and a new earth, and He will consummate the union between Christ and His Church in the eternal kingdom of God.

(c) Through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit the new age of the future is already present and through union with the risen Jesus Christ the Church on earth is already given to participate in the power of the resurrection. The Church of Jesus Christ in history is at once the congregation of sinners and the new creation, for although it continues to live and work within the brokenness and estrangement of this world and to share in its divisions, the Church belongs essentially to the new age and the new creation. As such the Church is summoned to perpetual renewal, to put off the old life, and by the renewal of its mind to be conformed to Christ, looking beyond its historical forms to the full unveiling of its new being in the coming Lord.

III

We have sought to declare in these brief paragraphs the inseparable relation between Christ and His Church. To these convictions about the Church we are led by our faith in Jesus Christ and by our shared acceptance of the authority of the Holy Scriptures. We cannot build the one Church by cleverly fitting together our divided inheritances. We can grow together towards fullness and unity in Christ only by being conformed to Him who is the Head of the Body and Lord of His people. And He manifests His fullness, however brokenly, in the gifts He has given to us even in our separations. Wherever two or three are gathered in His Name, He is in the midst of them. Wherever men are met in

obedience to Him, He is known. He may be found in the midst of those from whom we are separated and in the midst of those to whom we are sent.

When we place ourselves in our Churches under His judgment and in obedience to His calling and His sending, we shall know that we cannot manifest our unity and share in His fullness without being changed. Some of us who have been assured that we possess the true order and the true sacraments will find ourselves called to give its rightful place to the preaching of the Living Word. Some who have neglected the sacraments will be confronted by Him who humbled Himself in Baptism and broke bread and shared the cup to make us partakers of His passion and death. Those who have sought to show forth the glory of the Church as the Body and Bride of Christ must stand under the judgment of His simplicity and servanthood. Churches which have valued little His prayer that the oneness of His people be made manifest to men will be summoned to make His prayer their own. Churches complacent in the face of racial divisions in the Body will be brought to repentance by Him in whom bond and free, Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, are one. Churches which have stressed one-sidedly that God in His Church gives Himself to men will be reminded that Christ in His humanity offered Himself to the Father. Those who are ever looking backward and have accumulated much precious ecclesiastical baggage will perhaps be shown that pilgrims must travel light and that, if we are to share at last in the great Supper, we must let go much that we treasure. Churches settled and self-assured will have to hear again the Lord's heart-broken concern for the sheep without a shepherd and know that to be His Church is to share in His world-embracing mission. Churches too much at home in the world will hear themselves called out of the world. Churches too wrapped up in their own piety or their own survival will see again Him who identified Himself with the deprived and the oppressed.

We cannot know all that shall be disclosed to us when together we look to Him who is the Head of the Body. It is easy for us in our several Churches to think of what our separated brethren need to learn. Christ's love will make us more ready to learn what He can teach us through them. The truth we would hold fast is that because Christ is the Head and Lord of the Church,

His way is the Church's way. He calls, He sends, He judges. The shape of His life is the shape of the Church's life. The mystery of His life is the mystery of the Church's life.

IV

RECOMMENDATION

In our work we have been led to the conviction that it is of decisive importance for the advance of ecumenical work that the doctrine of the Church be treated in close relation both to the doctrine of Christ and to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. We believe that this must occupy a primary place in the future work of this movement, and we so recommend to the Faith and Order Commission, and to its Working Committee.

III

CONTINUITY AND UNITY



I. *The Unity of the Church as indicated in the New Testament*

(a) When we think of the unity of the Church in respect of the term 'People of God' we are all agreed that we must relate it to the other qualifications of the Church in the New Testament, all of which emphasise the Church's unity.

The Church, the newly-constituted 'People of God', called into being by His Word and His Spirit, is a community in which men recognise the Lordship of the one Christ, which lives by His grace, and which is fully empowered for His service. The Church witnesses to Jesus Christ as the Lord of all life, in its worship, in its order, and in its life. Thus by its nature it is destined, confronting mankind with its divine unity, to triumph over all enmities of nations.

This new people of God is described in the New Testament as the Body of Christ. Christ is the Head and He unites all believers in Himself. By the indwelling of the Holy Spirit the redeemed are united into a body, in the world but not of it, as a 'people of God's own possession', who share in common the gifts of the one Spirit. Since the Church is a fellowship in the Holy Spirit it follows that it is a *communio sanctorum*, a company of the sanctified—forgiven, justified by faith, and born anew in Christ.

(b) (i) All the various testimonies of faith in Christ found in the New Testament express one and the same faith, and all of them together belong to the revelation of God in Him.

(ii) While there are indications of diversity in worship in the New Testament, nevertheless the preaching of the Word and the administration of Baptism and the Lord's Supper were everywhere marks of the Church's unity.

(iii) We all believe that God gives to His Church unity in a rich

diversity of works of mercy, moral and social witness, and prophetic insight into human affairs. He united His Church in a love for the brethren and for all mankind which transcends every barrier of race, colour, class and nation.

(iv) In the New Testament the mission of the Church and the unity of the Church are deeply related. Christ called His apostles that they might be one and that He might send them forth to accomplish His mission in the world. He prayed for their unity that the world might believe. It was in obedience to this missionary task, including the willingness to suffer for Christ, that the Church experienced the dynamic power of its unity.

(v) The subject of church order, both in its New Testament phases and in its subsequent history, is treated in the following section.

II. *Unity, Continuity and Discontinuity*

(I) THE UNITY OF CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH

Life in the Church rests upon the operation of the Triune God but (as we have seen in Chapter II) there is a special need to examine the relationship of the Church to Christ. To quote from the Report of the Theological Commission on the Church:

‘Every communion holds that the Church is not a human contrivance, but God’s gift for the salvation of the world, that the saving acts of God in Christ brought it into being, that it persists in continuity in history by the presence and power of the Holy Spirit.’

The discussion of unity and continuity involves, therefore, the prior question of the nature of the relationship between Christ and the Church. The continuity of the Church is based upon the fact that Christ is her Head and that, therefore, there is but one holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, which has not only received the promise of Christ that ‘the gates of hell shall not prevail against it’, but also receives, as partaker of His resurrection, the earnest of her future triumph.

The Pauline image of the Church as the Body of Christ is no mere metaphor, but expresses a living reality. All agree in finding the presence of Jesus Christ, the crucified and risen Lord, both

living in and reigning over His Church. She is created as the realm of redemption by the sovereign grace of God and is also the sphere of His acts of judgment and reformation. We unite in affirming the solidarity between the Head and the members and also the sovereignty of the Head over the members in the Body of Christ. But there are differing emphases among us as to the differing modes of participation of the members in the Head. The former view stresses the fullness of Christ as something already received by the Church, though not always consciously apprehended, the latter the manifestation of this same fullness at the Coming of the Lord in glory. In the present age, however, it is in the Church under the Cross that the fullness of Christ is realised.

(2) THE NATURE OF CONTINUITY

From this difference of emphasis arise different opinions upon the nature of continuity. All agree not only upon the continuity assured by the constant action of the risen Lord through the Holy Spirit, but also upon the value of some form of continuity in history, assured by some means under the action of the Holy Spirit. All would emphasise the apostolic continuity of Christian life within the Christian community of men and women, redeemed by the one Cross of Christ, seeking to follow the example and teaching of the same Master and inspired by the continuing presence of the same living Lord. Most would also regard the preaching of the Gospel and the ministration of the sacraments as essential means of continuity.

While the vast majority of Christians would agree that some form of commissioned ministry was essential to the continuing life of the Church, serious and at present irreconcilable disagreement arises on the question whether some particular form of ministerial order is essential to the continuity of the Church.

It is clear then that nearly all communions possess and cherish some form of ministry for which in some way they find warrant in the New Testament.¹ Many would go further and find in the

¹ The evidence of the New Testament about church order can be variously interpreted.

(a) Some believe that already in the New Testament we find a development from the apostolic order towards episcopacy, despite the existence of other forms of ministering, subject to the apostolic tradition.

(b) Others hold that while there is evidence of variety of order in the New Testament, the general trend is not towards episcopacy but towards other

various forms of ministry which they already exercise a continuation of the mission of the Apostles. A special significance is, however, attached by some Churches to the possession of the historic episcopate in apostolic succession. Some, indeed, possess and value this without attaching any necessary doctrinal significance to it. For others, however, all other means of continuity are here focussed and they would regard common acceptance of a ministry in this succession as an essential step towards the unity of the Church and as the only sufficient safeguard of its historic continuity. The kind or degree of doctrinal interpretation implied in such an acceptance is still a matter of disagreement. Others would find apostolic succession to be one element in an organic structure of life and worship, faith and order, which, in their totality, constitute the principle of continuity.

It is clear that here is an obstinate difference, held with deep conviction and in a good conscience, which cannot readily be resolved. It is possible, however, to note some growth together. Churches which have not in the past been much given to the consideration of this question are finding greater value in an emphasis upon the idea and content of continuity than in former times, while Churches which emphasise particular forms of continuity as essential are finding the need to integrate more closely in their thinking the two elements of Faith and Order. We recall the words of the Report of the Lausanne Conference, which called for 'a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church of Christ as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole Body'. Some would hold that we have passed beyond this point in seeking a more precise content to the term 'ministry'. Here clearly a fresh starting-point to theological discussion is urgently needed. An approach to the question of the ministry, not as an isolated phenomenon but in the light of a profound christological

forms of order (e.g., congregational or presbyteral), and they would claim that Churches of these types of order reflect more nearly the primitive tradition.

(c) In the opinion of others again no clear line of development of ecclesiastical order can be discerned in the New Testament. Leadership within the Christian community accords with the varying needs of the Church but is always closely correlated with the responsibility of members and subject to the authority of Christ as Lord.

Recent biblical study has, however, led to a considerable growth together on the whole question.

and eschatological approach to the doctrine of the Church, is urgently needed. Beyond our theological and denominational emphases, we must seek to keep our eyes fixed upon Christ as Prophet, Priest and King and find in the vision of Him the focal point of ways which at present appear merely parallel.

We propose the establishment of a Theological Commission to explore more deeply the resources for further ecumenical discussion to be found in that common history which we have as Christians and which we have discovered to be longer, larger and richer than any of our separate histories in our divided Churches. Such a study would focus not only on the hard cores of disagreement between us, but also on the positive discoveries there to be made of the various levels of unity which underlie our diversities and dividedness.

(3) DISCONTINUITY

A consideration of the nature of continuity can only serve to throw into stronger relief the fact of discontinuity and the factors which have led historically to it.

(a) *Schism*. The term 'schism' appears to be used in two different senses. Some maintain that it can only be used of a breach between church organisations of an identical or closely similar pattern of life, faith and order, whether arising from political, cultural or even personal reasons, and leading to administrative or jurisdictional separation, total or partial. In this view, the term 'schism' would not be used in cases where matters of heresy were involved. Others, however, are accustomed to use the term in a wider sense to cover the separation of Christian groups on matters of doctrine (e.g. the Reformation). There appears to be a real need for the introduction of another agreed term for such divisions. Terms like 'breach' (in English), 'rupture' (in French), 'Spaltung' (in German), are possible, but for various reasons they cannot be regarded as fully satisfactory. In further study of this question the need is felt to discover words which as far as possible reflect the living nature of the Church.

The use of the terms 'heretic' and 'schismatic' between Christians is happily passing out of current usage, but the growth of mutual respect and charity and the desire for fuller unity with each other should not obscure the need for a serious consideration of the nature of division. We are all agreed that 'tragic' is not too

strong a word to express the effect of these divisions; that they sometimes become necessary is a sign of the presence of sin in the world. All would agree that a conflict of 'goods' as well as a choice of evils may be involved in some separations. To quote but one example: the Reformation is interpreted by many primarily as an act of obedience to God, while others will find involved in it a sinful breaking of the unity of the Church.

While many Churches would willingly recognise in the origin of their divisions, all would find in their maintenance, a matter in which our guilt is not one-sided but reciprocal. Some divisions arose from vital matters of Christian truth and life, others from impatience on the one side, and lack of understanding and vitality on the other—the refusal of a Church to reform itself or to meet new spiritual demands made upon it by its people and its historical situation. Sometimes divisions have occurred by the joint action of ecclesiastical and secular powers, issuing in persecution. There are also divisions which do not fall easily into these classifications and which are due in the main to social, cultural or racial tensions. We wish to call attention to the obligation to seek closer organic union which specially lies upon (a) Churches whose close regional association emphasises their task of bearing a common witness to the non-Christian world; (b) Churches whose historic past lays upon them to a peculiar degree the need for mutual reconciliation; (c) Churches having a close doctrinal or institutional affinity. While, however, we stress the importance of a reunion of Churches of closer spiritual heritage, we do not forget the need for, and the possibility of, a reunion of wider scope, which may bring together those of very different spiritual heritage. We particularly deplore the tendency to create further divisions in some parts of the world, often for the flimsiest of reasons, which, while we seek a closer unity, threatens to produce an even more disastrous situation.

Of recent years it has been widely maintained that our breaches as Christian denominations are rather breaches within than from the Church. Such a view can hardly be received by those who, for varying reasons, maintain that the *una sancta* (the one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church) cannot be broken, or by those who restrict the limits of the visible Church of Christ to a single denomination. Others, however, are prepared to see in this distinction a welcome affirmation of the continued existence of

church life on both sides of the breach. It was maintained, for example, that on each side of the breach there existed a *traditio ministrandi* (an ordered pattern of ministry of the Christian faith) and a profession of the Christian faith itself, although in either case it might be possible to find elements which really belong together held in isolation or even set in sharp opposition to each other. In a divided Christendom, there is an inescapable tension between our commission to exercise our ministry in the whole Church of Christ and its present restriction to the confines of a single denomination. A doctrinal protest can easily become a fixed theology. Such breaches, if always involving loss, do not necessarily mean total shipwreck, and it is the duty of all to look forward to a new integration of life and faith and a fulfilment of ministries in future steps towards organic unity. For some the problem of the divided Church and its reunion is linked to the question of *vestigia ecclesiae* (the characteristics of the universal Church still existing in the divided Churches). Here is an urgent problem for ecumenical research.

(b) *Apostasy*. Apostasy may be defined as in essence a denial of the sole Lordship of Christ in profession, attitude or action. Any loyalty, however innocent in itself, when exalted to the point where it conflicts with loyalty to God in Christ, tends towards apostasy. It is thus a manifestation of satanic power rebelling against God. It may take the positive form of aggressive rebellion against God or the more negative form of a lukewarm allegiance to Him. A special danger lies in the fact that apostasy sometimes clothes itself in a Christian vocabulary and outwardly Christian forms. The determination and judgment of apostasy belong to God and only pertain to the Church as revealed by Him. To-day a peculiar urgency attaches to the duty of the Church to reaffirm her sole loyalty to Christ in the face of the insidious advance of secularism, the challenge of a state absolutism which seeks to control the thought forms of the human individual and challenges the possibility of his whole existence as a Christian, and the menace of oppression in all its forms (political, economic or even ecclesiastical) in all parts of the world. Apostasy is a danger against which our denominations as a whole and ourselves as individuals ought to be watchful rather than a defect that we should wish to point out in others.

In the minds of some the possibility of widespread or even of

total apostasy is closely linked to the problem of discontinuity. Some Churches might possess the strongest possible outward form of continuity and yet in whole or in part be affected by apostasy. It is more normally held, however, that apostasy can take place either in an individual or in a Christian group, but it is not generally believed that the whole Church could ever fall into apostasy.

(c) *Heresy*. In the history of the Church heresy and division have often been closely connected. Christian teaching is always integrally related to Christian life, worship and action, just as in New Testament times the *kerygma* (proclamation), *koinonia* (fellowship) and the *diakonia* (Christian service) are not found in separation from each other. Properly speaking, heresy belongs to the first sphere alone and may be defined as an error of doctrine persistently proclaimed against an established norm of the Church, affecting vital matters of teaching. Since, however, life and thought, worship and action, are inseparable, it involves a distortion of the spiritual life of the Church and of the organic wholeness of the Christian faith. It is agreed that there are *necessaria* (necessary articles) in the Christian faith and we would restrict the word 'heresy' to this sphere, but we are not unanimous about their number and nature. We all recognise the obligation upon the Churches, while seeking to maintain in all its fullness the deposit of faith, to be responsive to the guidance of the Holy Spirit as He fulfils our Lord's promise to lead His Church into all truth and to bear continual witness to Him.

In all these matters judgment should properly belong to the whole visible Church of Christ, but in our divided state this judgment can and must be exercised by individual denominations and even congregations, acting through all their parts, or, as others would say, orders. Every effort must be made pastorally and spiritually for the reconciliation of the offender. If, however, sentence must in the last resort be passed upon him, we are united in repudiating any recourse to secular coercion and violence. The nature of the doctrinal norms by which heresy is to be judged are treated later in this chapter.

III. *Unity and Diversity*

(a) *Personal faith in Jesus Christ*. Faith in Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour, the original simple New Testament affirmation,

is confessed by all the communions here represented. This common faith allows for certain differences of interpretation and practice.

(b) *Consensus in doctrine.* All accept the Holy Scriptures as either the sole authority for doctrine or the primary and decisive part of those authorities to which they would appeal. Most accept the Ecumenical Creeds as an interpretation of the truth of the Bible or as marking a distinctive stage in the working-out of the orthodox faith. Some assign a special importance to the credal documents of the early Ecumenical Councils. Some would say that to found unity on any creeds is to found it on something human, namely, our understanding of the Gospel and our theological work in formulating its meaning. Some judge in accordance with the Inner Light and the leadings of the Spirit and are therefore concerned to witness against the use of outward creeds when these are held to be necessary or sufficient.

Many denominations possess confessional documents in which they express the Christian Faith as they read it in the Bible. It would generally be admitted, however, that these last documents would not be regarded as irreformable and they do not in fact occupy the same position in the Rule of Faith of all Churches which possess them.

We acknowledge the importance of theological study for intellectual clarification and continuous re-interpretation of the Christian faith in terms of changing life and thought. In listening to one another in ecumenical discussion we move towards a deeper understanding of each other in faith and doctrine.

(c) *Forms of worship and the sacraments.* The subject of forms of worship and the sacraments is treated in the next chapter.²

(d) *Evangelism.* The Church by its very nature is an evangelising fellowship with an inescapable missionary obligation.

There is among us a difference of opinion as to whether a Church has the right to evangelise members of another Christian communion. While some of us deny that such a right exists, others claim that it is an essential part of their mission. There are forms of proselytising, however, which are sub-Christian and should, therefore, find no place among the followers of our One Lord. In the united Church this problem would find its solution.

² *Note:* It should be noted throughout this report that most Baptists would prefer to use the term *ordinance* rather than 'sacrament'.

(e) *The Christian life.* We acknowledge that the Christian experience of God's redemptive grace finds its expression in Christian life in a variety of ways. We are agreed as to the necessity of witnessing for Christ, by word and deed in every human relationship. Service prompted and guided by love is the primary characteristic of the Christian way of living, and life's true interpretation is to be found in the idea that we are stewards of our Lord. We rejoice in the new emphasis upon the fact that our daily work is a sacred vocation or an offering to God.

(f) *Cultural factors.* We recognise that Christianity makes itself at home in various cultures and takes a colouring from them. We believe that every nation will bring its tribute to the common treasury of Christian faith and life. Christianity is never to be equated with any culture, however, for it has a spirit of its own which always transcends social, political, and cultural conditions. The Spirit creates unity, while one of the causes of division lies in treating as absolute cultural factors which are only relative.

We call upon the Churches honestly to face certain present social and cultural conditions which greatly accentuate the need for unity, e.g., the general disorder of human society, new migrations of population, the redrawing of political boundaries, state antagonism and persecution, the assumption by the modern state of responsibility for education and social work, and the achievement of national independence by countries in which the Churches were founded by Western missionary expansion. (See *Faith and Order Commission Paper No. 10*, where these factors are enumerated and discussed.)

While we recognise that social and cultural factors have operated most significantly to produce divisions among us, we call attention also to the fact that they have sometimes been the occasion of overcoming previously existing divisions. The unity found by Christians as a result of persecution is a striking illustration of this truth.

(g) *Varying degrees of recognition.* There is considerable variation in the degree of recognition accorded by one Christian body to another. Within the same confessional family it is customary to regard other regional and national Churches as Christian Churches in the full sense of the word. But full recognition in many instances is not extended outside the same confessional family. For example:

(1) Some Churches do not usually extend to others outside their tradition the right of participation in their sacramental life.

(2) When a member of one Church in good standing desires to transfer to another communion, some Churches require re-baptism or a new profession of faith.

(3) When a minister desires to transfer from one communion to another, some Churches require re-ordination.

Membership in the World Council of Churches implies a measure of recognition in that the Churches recognise one another as serving one Lord. But differences of faith and order still exist and membership in the Council does not imply that one Church must regard all other members as Churches in the full sense.

A more general form of recognition is extended, on the other hand, by the very fact of joining, in mutual respect, for the study of differences, engaging in co-operative endeavour in Christian action and missions, and occasionally gathering in common worship. In these and other ways Christians recognise one another as belonging to the Body of Christ and pray that they may grow by God's grace into greater unity and more complete mutual recognition.

IV. *The Unity we have and the Unity we seek*

We affirm that throughout Christendom there is, despite divisions, a unity already given by God in Christ, through whom 'the powers of the age to come' are already in our midst. Concerning the fact of this unity and of the participation in it of every Christian we have no doubt. The co-operation in the Ecumenical Movement is one practical proof that this unity is here. We affirm also our faith that the crucified and risen Christ is already working through His Holy Spirit to deliver us from the divisions which obscure this unity, and our sure hope that at His return in glory He will enable the manifestation of this unity to be complete. This very hope lays upon us all the inescapable duty of working and praying for the shortening of the days of our separation, in obedience to Him in whom we affirm ourselves to be one.

We differ, however, in our understanding of the relation of our unity in Christ to the visible holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. We are agreed that there are not two Churches, one visible and the other invisible, but one Church which must find visible

expression on earth, but we differ in our belief as to whether certain doctrinal, sacramental and ministerial forms are of the essence of the Church itself. In consequence, we differ in our understanding of the character of the unity of the Church on earth for which we hope (*The Church*, F.O.C. Papers No. 7, p. 16f.), though none of us looks forward to an institution with a rigid uniformity of governmental structure and all of us look forward to a time when all Christians can have unrestricted communion in Sacrament and fellowship with each other.

Yet our differences in the doctrinal and sacramental content of our faith and of our hope do not prevent us from being one in the act of believing and of hoping. For our faith and our hope are in the crucified and risen Jesus Christ, who is already working in us the purpose of His perfect will, and is already gathering up every fragment of obedient endeavour into the consummation of that purpose.

V. Illustrations of United Advance

We believe that it is God's will that we should be united, and we see in the urgent problems and the desperate needs of the whole modern world new calls and opportunities to hear the unifying Word of God.

In making recommendations that we hope will be effective without raising disagreements of principle, we yet recognise that all our working together is in greater or less measure impeded by the divisions among us created by our disagreements on faith and order. Within the Ecumenical Movement which has exposed our disagreements, we have none the less become aware of a definite area of unity, and it is being laid upon us by the Holy Spirit and the Word of God to come together increasingly in His service.

We make these recommendations in the conviction that we should do together all that can be done together, and do separately only that which must be done separately. Some of the recommendations that follow are elaborated in the Report of the Second Conference on Faith and Order held in Edinburgh in 1937.

I. We believe that the deliverance of this world from its religious disunion and bitter secular feuds can be achieved by Christians capable of presenting the practical challenges of Christian love to the self-interest in Churches and groups, and able to persist without the visible and immediate expectation of

success. It is the task of Christian communions to make known the call of God to their members to this ministry of reconciliation and to sustain them by bringing to them in their courage and loneliness the fellowship of the faith.

2. The separated communions will be helped to come together into the cause of Christian service by realising that the emotional legacy, which hinders their co-operating, is to a considerable extent the result of what have been called 'non-theological factors of denominationalism'. These are traditions of a political, national and social character. Awareness of these factors is the first step in ridding ourselves of the divisive feelings that they have aroused. We therefore urge on religious communions wishing to co-operate a special study of these hindrances.

One factor calling for special study is the tradition of establishment, which in some countries continues to be a source of division among the Churches.

3. We recognise that many of the most pressing and troubling problems of the modern world have arisen subsequent to the forming of our separate traditions of faith and order. They cannot therefore be dealt with adequately from within our traditional divisions. The Churches of to-day have to help each other answer their problems. Individuals equipped with special knowledge and spiritual insight to relate Christian teaching to these problems belong to the whole Church, and such messengers should be given greater opportunities to be heard by all Christian people.

4. We believe that the needs of our modern world call for closer fellowship and co-operation between those who serve God and their fellow-men in the offices and specific activities of the Church and those who, consciously or not, serve God and their fellow-men in other ways. We commend to the Churches the study of the research now being made by the World Council of Churches into this problem.

5. In the terrible political and ideological struggle which divides mankind to-day, we impress on all Christians the need for careful and accurate statement as to facts, whether in their own sphere of the world or in the other one, and we ask for honest appreciation and just criticism of whatever is good or evil in either way of life as it is being lived. The same spirit should govern words and actions in respect of every division that exists among men, whether between or within nations.

6. We think that we can profit by learning from each other's characteristic habits and methods and cultivating an appreciation of their values, not rejecting what may be profitable because it belongs to another tradition.

7. We hope for an increase in the interchange of teachers in theology and the theological intercourse of students in our theological and other colleges, and we recommend the introduction into the curriculum of the study of the Ecumenical Movement.

8. In view of the complexity of modern problems for Christian decision, we recommend united study groups for Christians living in the same locality and at work in the same occupational groups. We recommend also the formation and support of local 'Councils of Churches' for consultation and joint action. The Ecumenical Movement is not alive unless it is local.

9. We recommend the Churches to make a more determined attempt to carry out the proposal made at the Second Conference on Faith and Order at Edinburgh in the following words: 'The Conference (i.e., Edinburgh, 1937) urges on all the Churches the desirability of organising and participating in efforts of evangelism in co-operation with Christians of other communions, both as a means of bearing effective witness before the multitudes who are detached from Christianity and as a means of expressing and strengthening that unity in the Gospel which binds together in spiritual fellowship those who own allegiance to different Churches.'

10. We urge church authorities to consider conditions on which pulpits may be opened to ministers of other communions.

11. We commend the principle that older Churches should not unduly impress on younger Churches which have grown out of their missionary efforts, traditions that hinder their forming other Christian ties and impede their freedom of growth within their own societies.

12. We commend the practice of inter-church aid in which Christians, becoming sensitive to the pressing needs of others within the household of faith, unite to relieve them. And we urge all Christians to unite in the relieving of all kinds of human suffering without questioning the religious profession of the sufferers.

13. We urge that all who speak regarding other Christians by

either the written or the spoken word, maintain the highest standards of Christian charity, fairness and accuracy.

14. We ask for a greater observance on the part of all Christians of the designated periods of corporate prayer for Christian unity and ask the responsible authorities to arrange if possible for a co-ordination of weeks of prayer for unity.³

We believe that we should thank God for His gift in bringing into existence the World Council of Churches. We must not over-estimate its significance, but still less should we overlook the fact that in it God has given us, for manifesting our fellowship and common responsibility, an instrument which is unique in history.

God has brought us together in years of war and occupation, in prisons and camps, in areas of orphan missions, and for works of relief and reconstruction. In many quarters we have been brought nearer to each other by a rediscovery of the full message of the Gospel, of the Church, its worship and sacraments, and its service to the world. New forms of Christian community life have sprung up within various denominations. They are the promising signs of the ongoing renewing and uniting work of the Spirit throughout Christ's Church Universal.

In all of these advances the World Council of Churches has acted as a pervasive influence. Through it God, we believe, continues to call us, in the realms of fellowship and united service, to speak the word that is not yet spoken and do the deed that is not yet done.

VI. *Summary and Prospect*

In summary, the nature of the unity towards which we are striving is that of a visible fellowship in which all members, acknowledging Jesus Christ as living Lord and Saviour, shall recognise each other as belonging fully to His Body, to the end that the world may believe.

In His own day Jesus Christ will gather His scattered people to

³ *Note:* Since 1942 the officers of the Faith and Order movement have issued appeals for prayer at the time of the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity, January 18th-25th, and will continue to do so, pending any result from the negotiations asked for in the above paragraph. For previous consideration of this problem by the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, see p. 50 of the Minutes of its meeting at Chichester in 1949.

live in eternal union with Him. The joy of that union is already felt in such unitedness as is now ours. With light that pierces the Christian conscience that day of our Lord illuminates the solemn responsibility of every contemporary communion to prepare itself for unity.

Further Study

Some of us hold that the unity of the Church must be organic as being the unity of the Body of Christ. That Body must be composed of elements belonging to this world of space and time but these elements must be unified as the Body of the Lord by the unifying power of His indwelling Spirit; otherwise it would not be organic. At first sight this conception seems utterly opposed to the notion of a union of distinct Churches. But a covenant relationship *realised to the full* would bind the Churches together into the organic unity of the Body of Christ, because it would be a relationship *in Christo*, the indwelling *Creator Spiritus* unifying the distinct members.

There are others, however, who hold that to speak of a 'covenant' between denominations of Christians is to use the word 'covenant' in a way which is far removed from the biblical usage and conception. They would emphasise the finality of the 'covenant' once made by God through Christ, and would urge that the task of Christian unity is to make effective our common response to that covenant.

We believe that this is a most fruitful field for further study.

IV

WAYS OF WORSHIP



Preamble

The decision of the Edinburgh Conference to appoint a Theological Commission on Ways of Worship has proved to be an important step forward in the process of mutual understanding necessary to progress in Christian unity. The work of the Commission has strengthened the conviction that Worship, no less than Faith and Order, is essential to the being of the Church. It has also made it clear that disunity is as manifest in the differing ways of worship as in disagreements concerning doctrines and institutions. Indeed it is at this point that disunity becomes explicit and the sense of separation most acute.

Following on the work of the Commission, we attempt here to assess the measure of existing agreement and disagreement as to the meaning and practice of worship; to consider the bearing of this on the unity of the Church; and to suggest practical measures for the increase of mutual understanding.

Agreements

(1) We worship one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the Triune God, by whose Spirit all true worship is inspired and unto whom all Christian worship is offered.

(2) God Himself creates the faith by which we respond to Him in worship, by encountering us and speaking to us. (*Cf.* Gal. 2.20.)

By this we mean that at the moment of Christ's encounter with men, they are free to respond; but in the light of this response they understand that they could not have been seeking God had He not already found them, and that the faith by which they responded was itself God's gift to them.

(3) God's encounter with us, and the response to Him in worship, involves the whole man. (*Cf.* Matt. 22.37-40.) It is made in worship, in witness, and in Christian obedience and service.

(4) The response as expressed in worship involves adoration,

confession, hearing the Word of God, intercession, invocation, oblation, praise, supplication and thanksgiving.

(5) Word and Sacrament are both the gifts of God. In the reading and the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments, God offers us His grace, imparts saving knowledge of Himself and draws us into communion with Himself.

The members of the Society of Friends testify to the same experience through corporate silent worship and lay ministry arising therein.

(6) All worship is by and within the family of God's people, alike in heaven and on earth. Even in private prayer, the Christian is always praying with the Church as a member of the communion of saints. The worship of the congregation is both the basis of all private prayer and devotion, and a powerful and essential Christian witness to the world.

Unsolved Problems

We have attempted here to open the way for further discussion and explanation rather than to make a list of traditional oppositions which could only frustrate ecumenical progress. The statement does not propose an unreal harmonisation of differences which are firmly and sincerely held. Positive suggestions for furthering useful and frank discussion are offered on the basis of the actual views held by the member Churches. Conversation on the various differences in the doctrine and practice of worship has strengthened the conviction that, as Christians, we ought not to admit that any subject is intractable or that any obstacle is insuperable. Of this hope, our meetings have given evidence.

No written report can do justice to the real depth of mutual understanding achieved and enjoyed in the course of our discussions. Moreover, in spite of the profound differences between us in the matter of ways of worship, we were all agreed that the issues raised take us right to the heart of the Church's witness, and must always be discussed in the context of her continuing mission. However we view the Church's worship, we are unanimous that its setting is the Church's mission to the world.

(1) Differences of opinion as to the relation of Word and Sacrament have led to varying stresses upon the importance of preaching and the sacraments. This should never be more than a matter of emphasis. God's redeeming activity takes place in the worship

which He has established in His Church. The unity of worship ought to be stressed if we are to have it in its fullness.

(2) We all agree that worship concerns the whole of life. Yet, we give different emphases to the place in worship of things we can touch and see. For some, many earthly elements when blessed may have a quasi-sacramental use; for others, only the elements which the Lord has appointed ought to play a distinctive role in worship. Therefore the use of material things must be carefully studied in the light of our agreement that Christian worship takes place as the Triune God makes Himself known to His people in Word and Sacrament. Through the Holy Spirit God comes to His people redeeming not only them, but also in some sense, the whole creation.

(3) The precise classification of all forms of worship as '*liturgical*' and '*non-liturgical*' is difficult. Indeed the term '*liturgical*' must be understood as having a wider meaning than is implied in this distinction. Most forms of worship are in a sense liturgical. The real difficulty is between Churches having a set liturgy and those allowing more freedom to the individual minister.

Our conversations have revealed that there is a place and value for both. On the one hand the fixed form helps to maintain and hand on the heritage of belief and devotion. On the other hand there are times when much greater freedom is both desired and desirable. Furthermore it is the task of the Church to use liturgical prayer as a means of disciplining the private prayer of the individual, and enlarging the scope of his intercession; while the private prayer of the individual, in its turn, quickens the liturgical life and purges it from the taint of formalism.

In both, of course, it is all, in the end, the work of the Holy Spirit.

(4) Worship is always the worship of the whole people of God, the whole Church. The leadership of this worship can on some occasions be entrusted to any member. Yet most of our Churches believe that our Lord has called forth in His Church a stated ministry. To this ministry alone the leadership of certain acts of worship is restricted. This raises for us the question of the basis of this restriction. For some of us this restriction rests upon the belief that the Church by the guidance of the Holy Spirit calls some of its members to this or that function. For others it is based upon the belief that the Holy Spirit gives to some members

of the Church the appropriate grace of holy order. Again, some Churches emphasise the ministerial priesthood as definitely distinct from the priesthood of all believers.

We recognise that questions regarding the character of the ministry, priestly and prophetic, continue to be grave obstacles to unity. Behind them lie fundamental problems concerning the nature of grace and the person and work of Christ. These questions must be faced fully and frankly. Fruitful discussion here may well render less intractable the differences in defining the meaning of apostolic ministry and validity.

(5) Whatever may be our various opinions on the nature and efficacy of ritual acts, we are all agreed that *Deus non alligatur sacramentis*, and that (in the words of the Gospel) 'the wind bloweth where it listeth . . . so is everyone that is born of the Spirit' (St. John 3.8). We record in thankfulness that we have reached in our discussions a measure of understanding, which none of us could ever have anticipated, on the problem of the sacrificial element in Holy Communion. The mystery of the love of God, which we celebrate at the Lord's Table, surpasses human expression. But in our attempts to describe that mystery we have the warrant of Holy Scripture for using sacrificial language. 'Behold the Lamb of God. . . .'

Our Lord Jesus Christ in all His life on earth and chiefly in His death and resurrection has overcome the powers of darkness. In His one perfect and sufficient sacrifice on Calvary He offered perfect obedience to the Father in atonement for the sin of the whole world. This was an act of expiation made once and for all and is unrepeatable. In His risen and ascended life He ever makes intercession for us.

Our response in worship, then, is the praise, prayer, thanksgiving and offering of ourselves in faith and obedience made to the Father in the name of Jesus Christ. We make the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. It is at this point that our greatest difficulties arise as we seek to express just how our worship on earth is related to the eternal intercession of Christ in heaven. We all agree that there is an element of mystery here which can scarcely be expressed (Rom. 8.26).

Some of us believe that in the Lord's Supper, where they enter into communion with the crucified and risen Lord, they only offer a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and obedient service as a

response in faith to the benefits the Lord gives us. Others would like to insist, however, that in the Holy Eucharist the Lord Jesus Christ as our Great High Priest unites the oblation made by His body, the Church, with His own sacrifice, and so takes up her own adoration into the *Sanctus* of the company of heaven. Between these two views there are others to which a brief reference may not do full justice.

It is felt, however, that a deeper understanding of the meaning of 'unites' in the above paragraph, particularly in the light of biblical eschatology, might help to resolve real divergence and misunderstanding at this point.

N.B.—There are those among us who regret that the discussion of the Eucharist has concentrated on this sacrificial aspect. In their opinion the main issue is the real bodily presence of the crucified and risen Lord and our receiving of His body and blood.

(6) We are agreed in believing in the Communion of Saints as the fellowship of the whole company of believers on earth and in heaven. In its worship, the Church on earth joins in prayer and praise with angels and archangels and all the company of heaven. While all agree in accepting the communion of saints in this sense there is grave difference of interpretation. Some only use the word 'saints' to mean the whole Christian body in general. Others also use it in a special sense to denote the blessed saints in heaven.

Most people are ready to sing hymns of thanksgiving for the saints, thanking God for His victory in the lives of His people. Some would go further and venerate the saints in heaven to the extent of celebrating their feasts; still others would seek their intercession believing that they can help us who are still engaged in the earthly warfare. For many of those who venerate the saints, the Blessed Virgin Mary has a unique place. It is obvious that the status of the Blessed Virgin in Christian worship is a matter on which there is deep divergence. (*Cf.* the relevant essays in the *Ways of Worship* volume.)

We must recognise that for some this aspect of worship is an expression of love flowing through Christ's mystical body. Others believe that such usages would be contrary to their understanding of the whole of the Christian faith, and they neither know nor desire any intercessor other than their Saviour.

It is therefore clear that these issues can be discussed properly only in the context of the doctrine of grace and of the work of Christ and of the Holy Spirit.

Another divergence of view emerges in connection with the practice of prayers for the departed. Some hold that the departed require the help of our prayers, and that we are in charity bound to pray for them that the work of God begun in them may be brought to perfection. Others hold that in committing their beloved dead to the care of the God who gave His only Son to be the Saviour of sinners they may find joy and comfort in His love.

This matter also is one which demands most thorough theological work touching as it does the heart of redeeming grace.

Non-Theological Factors

Thus far this chapter has been concerned largely with the theology which underlies the agreements and disagreements in ways of worship. In considering our differences, however, we have been constrained to ask whether they spring, wholly or in part, from social, cultural and other factors. In what follows we offer suggestions towards a new line of approach which may help the Churches to see that many of the differences in ways of worship are not bound up, as has been thought, with irreconcilable dogmatic differences, but may co-exist in one Church.

The Churches on earth are *in via*, and therefore involved at every level in the tensions and conflicts of history. This involvement shows itself in their traditions of worship. Even the most cursory survey of these 'ways of worship' reveals the large part played by many sorts of non-theological factors.

In this statement we intend to concentrate on two of these, the *social* and *psychological*. At certain very important points these overlap as cause-factors making for the estrangement of Christian bodies. For instance, there is the crucial factor of language which operates both psychologically and socially. Round the expressions in a language there tends to gather a whole fabric of associations which are lost in translation, but which colour the use of the expressions in prayer and worship. Moreover, habits of worship differ from country to country. We have all heard of worshippers who complain that they cannot abide the 'foreign ways' of the people of such and such a land at prayer. The style of behaviour

seems to get in the way of the stranger's devotion. Here too we have an overlap of psychological and social factors.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that such intimacy of relation between faith and cultural tradition is a bad thing. On the contrary it often makes for health and vivacity of spiritual tradition. But because human beings are sinners, we have to reckon with the possibility of profound corruption here. A particular Church may unconsciously, in liturgical forms, take for granted social and political institutions which have received drastic criticism at once in theory and practice. For instance, certain clauses of the Anglican Litany belong to a quite different ordering of society from that of Great Britain to-day. A stranger must be puzzled, even antagonised by such archaism. In a divided Christendom such phenomena can easily create the impression that reconciliation between Churches involves the acceptance of what belongs to the accidents of their worldly history rather than to the vital substance of their faith. This is particularly serious when members of Christian Churches 'have done one another wrong' in conflicts which were social and political as well as religious in origin. What is needed here is a certain theological ruthlessness, combined with the realisation that, in the providence of God, what now seems to divide at this level can be so transformed as to enrich the experience of the whole people of God. For it is in His will that His Church has been placed in the world and in the midst of secular history. 'I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world: but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil one.'

It must be emphasised, however, that these political and social factors operate not merely to postpone re-union, but frequently contribute to hinder evangelism and to damage the internal life of individual Churches. Thus within the same Church there are often great differences of idiom between congregations recruited from different social classes. While there are perhaps signs of improvement discernible, one cannot neglect the many unhappy examples within Churches of discrimination practised on grounds of class, economic level, politics and race. When these are continued to the present or actually introduced *de novo*, existing divisions are not only hardened, but Churches are split on occasion into additional fragments.

Archaism of devotional habit also prevents the development

of the sort of liturgical forms suitable to the age in which we live. For instance, we do well to question what the view of nature implicit in the canticle *Benedicite* conveys to men equipped with skill to effect the colossal transformations of natural forces which are a commonplace of our day. It is not only the cause of Christian unity that compels us to rigorous and painful self-scrutiny at these points: it is the cause of evangelism itself that demands we sit in judgment on our forms of worship. Christian worship must indeed not be subordinated to the fluctuating requirements of human nature; it has its background in God's initiative and His revelation. But its gracious content must be presented in a manner congruent with the actualities of our common life.

The study of social factors in their impact upon our ways of worship is in its infancy. Its prosecution is a commanding duty of the Ecumenical Movement. When we pass to the *psychological* side of our statement we come to a field in which we are at present perhaps even more amateurs. At least, however, we must note the importance as a force of division of the attraction felt by some and the repulsion felt by others, when an elaborate ritual is used which seems designed to evoke a sense of mystery. There are many both learned and simple who find their imaginations stimulated by such symbolism; others mistrust what seems to them to savour of trickery and an assault on their emotions. Here the puritan and not seldom the man of science are at one in their reactions; both show a single-minded repudiation of what seems to them obscure, unreal and artificial. Their challenge is an important one and it cannot be dismissed as simply philistine. There is need for a thorough exploration of the concept of mystery in its bearing on worship, an exploration at once theological, metaphysical and psychological. This exploration would, of course, have to consider not only the way in which craving for mystery is met in elaborate liturgical worship, but also the way in which it is met in the charismatic forms characteristic of Pentecostals and others, whose life can easily be ignored by the theologically sophisticated. It remains sadly true that among Christians the willingness to submit their devotional preferences to any kind of psychological scrutiny is rare; until it is more common, we are not perhaps likely to advance far in liberating ourselves from the dominion of what can be merely a matter of

personal choice or chance inheritance. Until we have attempted this it is open to question how far we stand under the sovereignty of faith and are ready to meet the demands made upon us in this age.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) The Churches are asked to follow up the work of the Commission on Ways of Worship on the following lines:

(a) The cultivation of a sympathetic and reverent attitude by all Christian people towards all forms of worship, both 'liturgical' and 'non-liturgical', in which God confronts man.

(b) Detailed scrutiny of the grounds upon which the worship of each communion is based, and in this light the re-examination of its attitude to that of others.

(c) Reflection on the question: How far does the fact that there are varieties in forms of worship within the same communions make it possible to conceive of a similar rich diversity within a united Church?

(d) Study of the liturgical movements going on in various parts of the world, coupled with study of the roots of modern antagonism to Christian worship in all its forms.

(e) Thorough examination of the relationship between the unique sacrifice of Jesus Christ and man's response in worship and life.

(f) Consideration of the problem of the devotional life of those who find it difficult to attend public worship regularly and to use the appointed means of grace, e.g., mothers of families.

(g) The promotion of an analysis, psychological, historical and theological of the conditions and circumstances, both of origin and development, of particular traditions of Christian faith and worship.

(h) An examination of the existing situation in which some Churches regard the preaching of the Gospel as well as the eucharistic act as essential for worship, whereas others regard the Eucharist as by itself containing the essential elements of worship.

(i) A more detailed exploration, theological, metaphysical and psychological, of *mystery* in relation to worship. If this enterprise recommends itself we urge a proper co-operation with those expert in the psychological material relevant to our purpose.

N.B.—We stress the need to enlist the interest not only of liturgical experts, and of those responsible for the conduct of worship, but especially of members of the worshipping congregations.

(2) In the realm of immediate practical steps towards this end, we suggest:

(a) The holding of inter-confessional retreats, conferences, etc., for the study and practice of ways of worship, and of the spiritual life.

(b) The study by the appropriate committees of the member Churches of the material prepared for and at the Lund Conference.

(c) The inclusion in the curricula of theological colleges of courses on worship in an ecumenical setting.

(d) The encouragement of members of the participating Churches in this Conference to take advantage of what is offered by the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, the Student Christian Movement, etc., in this context.

(e) The request to those and similar organisations to give the fullest attention to the subject of worship in planning their work.

(f) Participation at all levels in the Churches in the work being done on the meaning of Baptism.

(g) The inclusion in the teaching of worship within each communion of opportunities to attend the worship of other traditions.

N.B.—Some delegates desire that it should be made clear that the acceptance of these suggestions, especially the latter points, must be subject to the provision of church discipline and of pastoral wisdom.

V

INTERCOMMUNION



I. *Introduction*

A

In the Report of the Second World Conference on Faith and Order at Edinburgh in 1937, the statement is made: 'We regard sacramental intercommunion as a necessary part of any satisfactory church unity'. The Continuation Committee felt the need of at once setting up a Commission to study the problems involved in the achievement of intercommunion, and made this one of the main subjects for consideration at the Lund Conference. During the past fifteen years, the Churches have been drawn closer together in worship, thought and service. The urgency of making progress towards closer fellowship at the Lord's Table is very widely felt in all parts of the world.

There are those for whom the very word 'Intercommunion' raises difficulties. In their view the observance of Holy Communion is an act of the Church as One Body. It cannot properly be celebrated as a joint act of bodies which in their church life and doctrine are separated from each other. This is the view of the Orthodox Church. It seems well to make clear at the outset that so far as the Orthodox are concerned the question of intercommunion as ordinarily understood does not exist.

Our discussions have naturally been mainly concerned with the views of those Churches which are able to envisage sacramental fellowship without complete organic union. For almost all of these Churches the matter has become one of growing concern. The following considerations indicate the seriousness of the issues at stake:

(I) By joining together in the World Council of Churches, the Churches have taken a decisive step towards closer association. They have affirmed their will to stay together and to bear one another's burdens. This new mutual commitment raises ever

more sharply the question of what justification remains for continuing in division at the Lord's Table.

(2) New factors in the present historical situation demand that any barriers to fellowship which are not based on fundamental divergences of faith and order should be removed as speedily as possible. We need only refer here to the new missionary opportunities in Asia and Africa, the tragic stress of persecution and war conditions, the new inter-Church agreements and unions in both East and West, and the increasing demand of Christian youth to be set free from barriers to unity in fellowship and action.

(3) The ultimate urgency comes from our Lord's call to us. He calls His Church to lay open all its life to His transforming power. In their earthly pilgrimage, Christians are always under His judgment, and in the midst of their divisions live always toward the day of His final sifting of those who have in faith truly served Him and those who have not. Christ's followers stand under the imperative of His prayer that they all may be one. They are bound to work and pray to overcome whatever separates them from one another in the sacrament of Holy Communion.

There are some for whom these considerations have such weight that they find it difficult to brook any delay in the achievement of intercommunion. We are painfully aware that as long as we remain divided at the Lord's Table we cannot fully enjoy and express the unity which has been given us in Christ. On the other hand, we recognise that non-theological factors may sometimes lead to the premature union of separated bodies of Christians. It is of the utmost importance that all unions find their basis in the teaching of Scripture and be tested by conformity to the Word of God. There should be no move toward intercommunion which would treat our differences superficially or would use intercommunion as a means of by-passing difficulties.

B

During the years since the Edinburgh Conference we have become increasingly conscious of the depth and difficulty of the issues of faith and order which must be faced if closer unity at the Lord's Table is to be achieved. It is not a question merely of human pride and stubbornness, much as we confess that these are

operative in all of us. The difficulties arise from profoundly held differences of conviction about the nature of the Church and of the sacraments. These cause grief and perplexity to us all. Their character and extent have already been examined in earlier sections of this report. The achievement of full sacramental fellowship depends, in part at least, upon fuller agreement in these matters.

For many of us the Open Services of Holy Communion held at Tambaram, Amsterdam and Lund have been encouraging occasions of ecumenical fellowship in this central act of the Church's worship. Nevertheless, the fact that some of our number could not conscientiously participate in these services has demonstrated to all of us the painful nature of the problem. The prayerful self-searching in love which all of us have been forced to make on such occasions is, we believe, an earnest of the Lord's continual presence and of His ultimate purpose to make us one in Him.

We acknowledge, then, the complexity of the task which still lies before our Churches, but believe that we see more clearly the issues at stake and the need for continued thought and prayer together.

II. Terminology

In the Edinburgh Report, the conviction was expressed that when the term 'intercommunion' is used in discussion of church unity 'its meaning should be clearly defined'. The developments of recent years have made this essential, but the relationships which exist between Churches are so varied that it is extremely difficult to find a terminology that is generally acceptable and can be easily understood by different traditions and in different languages.

The word 'communion', or *koinonia*, denotes unity of fellowship in the whole life of the Church. The word 'communion' has also come to be applied in a special sense by many Christians to the Lord's Supper.

For purposes of ecumenical discussion, and with respect to the relations between separated Churches, the following usages and definitions seem advisable. It is important to remember, however, that none of the relationships described below can be regarded as the fulfilment of that complete unity which we believe to be God's will for His Church. It should also be noted that the following categories are not all mutually exclusive. Thus, the agreement

between the Old Catholic Church and certain Churches of the Anglican communion cited under (3) below could have been cited under (2).

(1) *Full Communion* (though the adjective need rarely be used): where Churches in doctrinal agreement, or of the same confessional family, allow communicant members freely to communicate at the altars of each, and where there is freedom of ministers to officiate sacramentally in either Church (i.e., *Intercelebration*) e.g., the Orthodox, Anglican, Lutheran, and Reformed (Presbyterian) 'families' of Churches, respectively.

(2) *Intercommunion and Intercelebration*: where two Churches not of the same confessional family, by agreement allow communicant members freely to communicate at the altars of each, and where there is freedom of ministers to officiate sacramentally in either Church, e.g., Lutheran and Reformed Churches in France. N.B.—The relations at present existing between the Church of South India and the Church of England are a special case of this kind, involving certain specific limitations.

(3) *Intercommunion*: where two Churches, not of the same confessional family, by agreement allow communicant members freely to communicate at the altars of each, e.g., Churches of the Anglican communion and Old Catholics, Protestant Episcopal Church and Polish National Catholic Church in U.S.A. Subject to differences of language, etc., intercommunion in most cases would also involve intercelebration.

(4) *Open Communion*: where a Church on principle invites members of other Churches to receive communion when they are present at its communion services, e.g., the Methodist, Congregationalist, and most of the Reformed Churches.

(5) *Mutual Open Communion*: where two or more Churches on principle invite each other's members and the members are free to accept the invitation. This does not necessarily involve intercelebration.

(6) *Limited Open Communion* (Communion by Economy or Dispensation): the admission of members of other Churches not in full communion or intercommunion to the Sacrament in cases of emergency or in other special circumstances.

(7) *Closed Communion*: where a Church limits participation in the Lord's Supper to its own members.

III. *The Ordering of the Lord's Table*

A

(1) We are agreed that the Table is the Lord's and that He gives Himself to us in the sacrament of Holy Communion. When we are unable to share together in the Lord's Supper the pain and scandal of our divisions is most severely felt because we seek the one Lord, and know that we should be able to partake as brethren in the family of God at one Table.

(2) We further agree that the responsibility for the due ordering of the Table in the name of Christ has been committed to the Church. She has to warn her members that if they 'eat and drink unworthily, not discerning the Lord's Body' they bring themselves under judgment. Because of our divisions the exercise of this responsibility, in the formulation of regulations for admission to the Table, is carried out by the several Churches. In this administration each has a grave responsibility before God, particularly if it withholds the sacrament from any of God's people. Baptism, instruction, profession of faith, and some standard of Christian conduct are generally required. Thus the requirement of episcopal Confirmation on the part of some Churches is one way of discharging the Church's responsibility in this matter. Those Churches which practise Open Communion have their own requirements for participation; the invitation extended is not to be interpreted as applying to the unbelieving or the unprepared.

(3) We are agreed in recognising the administration of the Lord's Supper in the divided Churches, when controlled by the words of institution, as real means of grace through which Christ gives Himself to those who in faith receive the appointed elements of bread and wine.

(4) The Churches have progressed towards unity in their understanding of the theological interpretation of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and we believe that agreement in this field is in fact greater than commonly appears. We have studied with satisfaction the statement of doctrine contained in the Report of the preparatory Commission on *Intercommunion* (pp. 29-30), and believe that the great majority of our Churches are able to accept it in this slightly emended form: This dominical sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, controlled by the words of institution, with the use of the appointed elements of bread and wine, is: (a)

a memorial of Christ's incarnation and earthly ministry, of His death and resurrection; (b) a sacrament in which He is truly present to give Himself to us, uniting us to Himself, to His eternal Sacrifice, and to one another; and (c) eschatologically, an anticipation of our fellowship with Christ in His eternal kingdom.

B

We differ as to the right or responsibility of a Church to refuse admission to the Lord's Table to members of other Churches, or to restrain its own members from participating in the sacraments of another Church, on the grounds of divergence in faith or order.

(I) The majority of us, without for a moment losing sight of the ultimate goal of full unity, believe that there already exists among the members of the World Council of Churches such a fundamental unity as to justify, or indeed require, joint participation at the Lord's Table. Those who hold this view would express their position thus:

A valuable preparation for the fuller unity to which we look forward would be the extension of the practice of intercommunion between different Churches. This is borne out by the experience of the Churches in South India in the years leading up to the union of 1947. Intercommunion is not a substitute for reunion. It is not an end in itself. It does not imply that all differences are resolved or have lost their significance. While intercommunion is, in many ways, illogical and anomalous, we ought to realise that the situation in which we all stand and with which we have to deal is itself highly anomalous. By membership together in the World Council of Churches we all recognise in each other's Churches 'elements of the true Church' (*The Church, the Churches and the World Council of Churches*, IV, 5) and yet we are separated from each other. In advocating intercommunion, we do not mean that all the Churches here represented should at once declare themselves to have intercommunion with each other. Intercommunion must be agreed upon between two or more Churches as such, on the basis of a common life in Christ, sufficient to preclude any unreality in the practice of intercommunion. It might

involve conditions, and even sacrifices, though not of principle. But we affirm that intercommunion, when thus agreed without sacrifice of principle, may properly and beneficially precede reunion. There will be no perfect solution of our problem until full visible unity. In the meantime, the extension of the practice of intercommunion, with all its difficulties, appears to be a valuable way forward.

Where there still cannot be any formal relationship of intercommunion, there should be an extension of the practice of open communion services on special occasions and in special circumstances.

(2) Others, without questioning the reality of our present unity, believe that fellowship in the Sacrament rightly exists only where there is fuller agreement in doctrine, a mutually acceptable ministry, or organic unity of church life.

Certain Lutheran Churches, maintaining that fellowship in the Lord's Supper depends upon the unity of the Church, and that such unity only exists where there is agreement in the proclamation of the Gospel, are unable to practise intercommunion where this would imply that the doctrine of the real presence of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ in, with, and under the elements of bread and wine is false or unimportant. Many Anglicans, in accordance with the statement of the Lambeth Conference, 1930, would hold that 'intercommunion should be the goal of, rather than a means to, the restoration of unity' (Resolution 42) and that they should always in these matters so act as to bear witness to the principle that the proper minister of the Sacrament is a priest episcopally ordained. For the Orthodox, as stated above, fellowship in the Eucharist is possible only between those who are members of the Orthodox Church.

It should be observed, however, that, with the exception of the Greek Orthodox Church, no one of the member Churches of the World Council so strictly interprets its responsibility for the ordering of the Lord's Table as to deny the Sacrament to members of other Churches in cases of urgent need.

C

All our Churches are profoundly concerned about the problems connected with intercommunion. Differences in practice and theology do not here correspond exactly with denominational or confessional boundaries. In certain Churches there is acute division of opinion on these issues. We have not been able to resolve the differences and tensions that exist among us. They will be found set out with great care and at greater length, and discussed from varying points of view, in the volume *Intercommunion* (edited by D. M. Baillie and John Marsh). This volume deserves most careful attention and should receive earnest and sympathetic study by all our church authorities.

Our discussions together at Lund lead us to recommend that:

(1) All Churches should re-examine their ways of ordering and administering the Lord's Supper with a view to discovering whether there is or can be agreement with regard to the basic requirements from communicants. Greater thought and care on this matter by all Churches might well pave the way for closer agreement, and help towards relationships of intercommunion where these do not at present exist.

(2) All Churches should give attention to the relationship of their theology and practice of Baptism to their theology and practice of the Lord's Supper. Our attention has been drawn to the essay by Professor T. F. Torrance in the volume *Intercommunion* and to his suggestion that 'to refuse the Eucharist to those baptised into Christ Jesus and incorporated into His resurrection-body (i.e., the Church) amounts either to a denial of the transcendent reality of Holy Baptism or to attempted schism within the Body of Christ' (*op. cit.*, p. 339). We believe that this challenging statement might provide the starting point for further fruitful ecumenical discussion.

(3) Churches which require full doctrinal agreement prior to communion fellowship and Churches which require episcopal ordination as the test of a valid sacrament should carefully re-examine their practice in the light of exceptions which are already customary by way of Limited Open Communion, or Communion by Economy or Dispensation.

(4) Churches which practise Mutual Open Communion should seriously examine the objections to the practice urged on grounds

both of doctrine and order. They should also ask themselves whether they could not and should not move on towards a closer relationship of visible unity, in view of the relationship of the Sacrament to the wholeness of the Church.

In closing this section of our report, we cannot but express our deep disappointment and concern that there is not a larger measure of agreement among us. We echo the view of the preparatory Commission on *Intercommunion* that 'neither we nor the Churches from which we come have yet gone deeply enough into the penitence from which healing may arise' (p. 31).

IV. *Communion Services at Ecumenical Gatherings*

The growth of the Ecumenical Movement has greatly sharpened in recent years the problem of communion services being held in the setting of conferences where Christians from a variety of Churches are gathered together for some days or weeks. Their life and worship together are not complete unless they can have the fellowship of the Lord's Table. In cases where all the Churches represented are in Full Communion or Intercommunion with each other (or are prepared to sanction an Open Communion on such occasions), there need be no difficulty; a single communion service can be arranged, at which a minister will celebrate according to the order of his own Church, and all can partake. But where these conditions do not exist there is a real problem, which has been felt acutely by many in recent years. We recognise that we are only at the beginning of the consideration of this problem and do not yet realise all its implications.

It is to the Church of Christ that the sacrament of Holy Communion is entrusted, and wherever a minister celebrates, his action involves the implicit claim that he does so as a minister of the Church Universal. In the present state of division, however, although he is commissioned in the name of Christ, his authority is derived through one of the Churches only, and will perhaps not be acknowledged by all. A conference, gathered together in the name of Christ, even though it may be regarded as a temporary and local expression of the Church, does not claim the right to ordain or authorise its own ministry to celebrate the Sacrament. Consequently, when the members of such a group belong to Churches which are not in communion with each other (in any of the ways mentioned above), no one celebrant will be

recognised by all as properly authorised to administer the Sacrament. When all members are not able to meet at the Lord's Table, no service which is held can be regarded as *the* communion service of the conference. For such difficult situations we wish to make the following recommendations:

(1) There should always be a united service of preparation for Holy Communion, with special emphasis on the note of penitence for our separation from each other.

(2) There should be opportunity for communion services at such times as will make it possible for every member of the conference to receive communion somewhere without violation of his own conscience or disloyalty to his church tradition. These should be held at different times.

(3) Though on the grounds already indicated there are some who object to open communion services, yet we believe there should be an opportunity of this kind for the many who desire such services and are free to partake. Such services should where possible be held on the invitation of the local church or churches which sanction such services. (Usually a very large proportion of the members of a conference will partake. Notable examples of this were the communion services held in the Nieuwe Kerk of Amsterdam in 1948 and in Lund Cathedral in 1952, and many regard such memorable occasions as of historic importance. At the I.M.C. Conference at Tambaram in 1938 two open communion services were held, one of which was Anglican.)

(4) At conferences held at places remote from local churches, or in ecumenical institutions, similar arrangements may be made within the conference or community. The celebrant in each case should be a minister, who will celebrate according to the order of his own Church, and issue such an invitation as he is authorised to give.

(5) It is important that those who cannot partake at a particular communion service should be invited to attend the service as worshippers, though they cannot receive communion. This has been found by many to be a means of real blessing of spiritual communion, and of deeper understanding and fellowship.

In making these recommendations we realise that they do not by any means solve the practical problem, which arises from the as yet unreconciled divergences in the doctrine of the Church.

Doctrinal as well as practical issues must be further explored. We are agreed that this particular aspect of the problem of intercommunion should be very strongly driven home upon the conscience of the Churches and of the leaders of the Ecumenical Movement. In particular further careful study of the principles underlying procedure at ecumenical conferences and institutions should be undertaken by the newly appointed Faith and Order Commission.

VI

WHERE DO WE STAND?



I

We confess our faith in the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church which is God's gift for the salvation of the world. The saving acts of God in Christ brought the Church into being, and it persists in continuity in history by the power of the Word of God and the presence of the Holy Spirit.

The Church's vocation is to glorify God in adoration and in self-sacrificing service to mankind, bearing witness in its corporate life to God's redeeming grace in Jesus Christ, proclaiming the good news to every creature, making disciples of all nations, and bringing Christ's commandments to communities as well as individuals.

We make these affirmations in our conviction of an underlying unity of life in Christ. Christ has made us His own and Christ is not divided. In seeking Him we find one another, and we humbly and gratefully acknowledge this unity as given of God. It enables us to face our divisions penitently, and under the continued guidance of the Holy Spirit we resolve to seek new ways of approach to each other.

Discussion reveals serious differences, especially concerning the beliefs held by or within some of the Churches about the authority of the Church, its limits and the mode of its definition. The examination of these differences in the preparatory work of the Theological Commission and in the experience of personal encounter reveals an encouraging degree of common ground. We have made genuine progress and there is no reason for pessimism. Nevertheless we have now reached a point at which our divergences stubbornly resist easy solution.

Part of the difficulty is that the language which expresses our understanding of the faith is sometimes an inadequate means of

communicating our convictions one to another. We may discover that some of this language embodies insights which in the divisions of the Church have become isolated from the wholeness of Christian Truth. Often particular emphases become restrictive bonds, from which denominational life is not easily freed. It is in ecumenical meeting that we are made aware of a wholeness that must both include and complete the faith and life of the separated members of God's Family. Here we are faced with the dilemma of a proper confessional loyalty and obedience to the richer unity of the One Church to which Christ points us, of which through the Faith and Order movement we have caught a clearer vision.

II

Conscious and deliberate theological work is always one important line of advance, as the Report of the Theological Commission on The Church states. Recent research in various fields throws new light on our disagreements. We suggest serious consideration of the following:

By the final revelation of God in Jesus Christ at a particular point in history, the Church lives, but it is within the continuous movement of history that it bears witness to this Gospel and applies it to human need. The thought forms and language through which the Church proclaims the one Gospel are therefore subject to the limitations and changes of history. But the nature of any given historical period is such that in no one age can the truth of God's revelation be given full expression. This does not mean that the Church should subordinate its message to the relativities of history, for we believe that the revelation of God in Jesus Christ and the scriptural witness to it are unique and normative for all ages. The Church should seek to proclaim this truth in ever-new terms, but the language and thought forms coined in history must be constantly corrected by the content of the Gospel. This is also true of those means by which the Churches have confessed their faith in decisive moments of their history. We must always make sure in contending for our distinctive convictions that we distinguish between the confession of the Truth to which we are committed and those expressions of it that were in part products of a particular age.

If all denominations are prepared to do this in obedience to the Gospel alone, we may well come nearer to one another.

Furthermore, this work of interpretation of the Churches to each other and to the world takes place in an intellectual climate that has undergone far-reaching changes. Our understanding of the Scriptures to which the Reformers made their primary appeal has greatly advanced. Whereas this in itself has brought new problems it has also given a new expression to the biblical revelation in its greatness and transcendence. As examples we may cite developments in the study of biblical estimates of man, biblical forms of communication and biblical methods of interpretation. This biblical study cuts across denominational lines and often provides a fresh starting-point for re-thinking denominational relationships.

In addition scientific investigation of the physical universe has opened up new and vast horizons, and most of our divisions antedate these great changes in our knowledge concerning man and the world in which he lives. This, clearly, does not affect our central convictions, but it has influenced the manner in which we present them to each other.

III

The Gospel is always received by men living within certain particular circumstances—cultural, social, political and economic. Within these circumstances Christians are called to embody and maintain their allegiance to God. The Church, constantly renewed and sustained by God's saving activity, lives in history and fulfils its mission under the manifold pressures of man's finite and sinful life. It stands on the frontier between the Word and the world, constantly tempted by the motives of a society that seeks to organise and preserve itself apart from God. Many of our pre-suppositions and prejudices, usually unconscious and unavowed, are the outcome of worldly pride and self-assertion. Cultural conditions are sometimes treated as essential to the Gospel. National aims are on occasion identified with God's will. We have all received patterns of thought not only from the Gospel but also from the structure of society (e.g. we are influenced by conflicting conceptions of freedom and justice, equality and

democracy). These conceptions sometimes colour our understanding of the Gospel and tend to divide us.

The importance of such influences upon our Churches cannot be denied. They have played a part in creating our divisions. They still play a part in maintaining these divisions. They inhibit our understanding of the message of salvation and seriously impede the fulfilment of our mission. Unless they are seriously tested as in the sight of God, they may involve us unawares in a dangerous complacency. The Churches must therefore examine those areas in which these influences are most productive of suspicion and even hostility among Christians. We meet such problems, for example, in the tension between Roman and non-Roman expressions of Catholicity, and where Churches are living and working in areas dominated by political systems which are sharply divided from one another.

When we seek to isolate the tensions due to these forces, we more readily locate the hidden factors in other people than we do in ourselves. We are slow to undertake the painful scrutiny of our own situation. If we are to deal courageously and adequately with these subtle forces, we must hear humbly and willingly what others say to us. God seeks to speak to each through the other and we may hear His voice only in the context of Christian brotherhood.

IV

The Church in our time is experiencing anew the sense of crisis and urgency that marked the Apostolic Age. In a period when persecution is again a reality, the dividing walls between Christian groups become transparent, and a new perspective on essentials and non-essentials brings a deeper unity to the people of God. When our obedience to the faith confronts the world with a strong Christian witness, suffering ceases to be a temporary emergency and becomes again a part of the normal experience of the Church. Christians who are complacent in their security are called not only to fellowship with their brethren under persecution, but to that humble self-examination which takes account of their own shortcomings and prepares them to bear whatever burdens God's will may lay upon them.

Members of the younger Churches have contributed to the

understanding of our common task a distinctive emphasis which has greatly enriched our discussions. Under the constraint of the missionary imperative, they have discovered that the need of unity is fully understood only when related to the great task of evangelism. Their strong awareness of our fundamental oneness in Christ is due not merely to their relative immunity to the influences which produced and still maintain divisions among the older Churches, but also to their response to the demand for full obedience to the requirements of faithful witness and service. In their experience we can surely see the leading of the Holy Spirit. The miracle of this unity has disclosed to the older Churches the tragic extent to which their own witness has been impaired by their separation.

Each Church must accept the problem of disunion as an inseparable part of its own responsibility. In such acceptance we may find a surer movement towards each other. We commend to the Churches the careful study of the report on *The Church* prepared by the Faith and Order Commission, calling attention particularly to the special theological tasks enumerated therein. If these can be undertaken by representative groups—groups which benefit from the resources of the experts but which secure the participation of others, and which mobilise the latent forces of each Church yet also transcend denominational lines—we are convinced that new light can be shed on our disagreements.

Furthermore we believe that all Christians are called to a deeper common participation in prayer and worship, in obedience, fellowship and service. These, no less than theological discussion, are means whereby the unity of the Church in Christ is manifested and known.

The work of the Lund Conference and the nature of its true contribution to the life of the Body of Christ cannot be judged in the short perspective of a few days. The end of this Conference marks only the beginning of the ways in which its concern with the unsolved problems of the Church can, in the providence of God, extend its influence throughout the whole community of Christian people. In confronting the fundamental issues of Christian unity we have been working at a level far more profound than that at which our Churches originally discovered their more obvious agreements. This deeper sense of the tensions within the family of God has compelled us to face the crucial points of

our disagreement. We have not resolved our differences nor brought forth before the world a simple method of achieving unity. Yet we have safeguards against complacency far more important in character. This Conference, by its very existence as well as by repeated emphasis, has called the Churches both to a deeper awareness of their common faith and to a more resolute effort to translate that faith into terms clearly visible in their common life. More perfect agreement waits upon a more adventurous courage and upon a more urgent effort of the will. We believe that 'if any man will do His will he shall know' what is God's purpose for His children.

In the task which lies ahead there is a part which every Christian can play. The insufficiency of our discipleship is due to the imperfection of our dedication to God's will. If our Churches have not risen to match the needs of the world with a clear demonstration of God's will and purpose, the cause lies partly in the apathy of so many who call themselves by Christ's name. When Christian people have humbly returned to the only springs of mercy and power, they will find that their feet are firmly set upon the path to that unity which God has designed for His people. Most earnestly therefore we summon all Christians to the duty of constantly renewed self-dedication to the will of God. And when we are ready humbly to receive what God is waiting to give us, we shall know that the greatest treasures of His Church are never of human achievement but always of divine grace.

Part Two

FROM EDINBURGH TO LUND

(1937-53)

FROM EDINBURGH TO LUND (1937-53)

The story of Faith and Order from its first conception in 1910 down to the preparation of the Report of the Edinburgh Conference in 1937 is told in the two volumes which are the predecessors of this one.¹ The next stage falls into four periods: 1937-9, the beginnings of work to implement the Edinburgh Conference Report; 1939-45, the restricted activity of the war years; 1945-8, the last activities of the old Edinburgh Continuation Committee; 1948-52, new beginnings as the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches and its work from the Amsterdam Assembly to the Lund Conference.

I

1937-9

The Continuation Committee held its first meeting after Edinburgh from August 29th to September 1st, 1938, with William Temple, then Archbishop of York, in the chair. The business included the receiving of the report of a special committee which had been held at Utrecht in the previous May to discuss the formation of the proposed World Council of Churches. A group known as the Committee of Fourteen, consisting of seven official representatives each of the Life and Work movement and of the Faith and Order movement, had been one of the provisions of the report to the Edinburgh Conference approving the proposal that a World Council of Churches be formed.² After a considerable discussion, in the course of which Dr. Temple agreed to be responsible, as Chairman of Faith and Order, for securing any amendments to the Constitution that might still be needed to bring the proposed Constitution of the

¹ *Faith and Order, Lausanne 1927*, edited by H. N. Bate, S.C.M. Press, 1927, and *Faith and Order, Edinburgh 1937*, edited by Leonard Hodgson, S.C.M. Press, 1938.

² See p. 47 of the Edinburgh Report.

Council into conformity with the requirements of the Edinburgh Conference, the Continuation Committee accepted the proposal of the Utrecht Conference and appointed Dr. Newton Flew and Dr. J. H. MacCracken to represent Faith and Order on the World Council Provisional Committee.

In its theological business, this meeting of the Continuation Committee made first plans for the study of the subject of the Church, and invited Dr. Newton Flew to be Chairman of a preparatory theological commission, whose subject should be simply 'The Church'. It was also agreed that the American Section of Faith and Order should be asked to appoint a theological committee to co-operate with the Theological Commission under Dr. Newton Flew following whatever plan might approve itself to both groups after full consultation. The Committee also discussed what were called at that stage 'plans for the study of liturgical questions'. But it was felt that matters were not sufficiently advanced to proceed at that meeting to the appointment of a commission. Dr. E. J. Hagan of the Church of Scotland had suggested in the discussion that a prominent place should be given to the problem of intercommunion, and it was agreed that the topic should be included in the whole discussion to be held at the next meeting.

From August 21st to 23rd, 1939, a further meeting of the Continuation Committee was held, once more in the familiar setting of St. George's School, Clarendon. At this meeting it was agreed to appoint two theological commissions, one to study ways of worship and a separate one to study intercommunion. The terms of reference of both commissions were agreed,³ but the appointment of chairmen was left to the Secretary in consultation with the Executive, the chairmen themselves then to appoint the members of the commissions for ratification by the Executive. It had been intended to continue on Thursday, August 24th, a fuller discussion of these two subjects, together with proposals which Dr. Flew had made for the work of the Commission on the Church. But towards the close of the discussion on the Wednesday night, news was brought that the European situation seemed so serious as to make it wise to end the Committee's business and to enable members living in distant countries beyond possible war zones to start for home. Within a few days the second World War had begun.

³ See pp. 75-6 of the 1939 minutes, No. 92.

II

1939-45

It was fortunate that an active co-operating committee in the United States had been set up. Under the chairmanship of Dr. G. W. Richards a great deal of work was carried out on the American side of the Atlantic. The American Theological Committee met in October, 1939, and decided that it should go forward with its studies along the lines of the topics proposed by Dr. Newton Flew in August, 1938. An extremely representative committee held meetings in the summer of 1940 and again in November, and in June, 1941. Finally the full report of the American Committee on The Church was published in 1945 in the United States, and re-published in preparation for the Lund Conference as the second part of the volume on the Church to which reference will be made later. Similarly, an American Section set to work upon the problem of intercommunion. The American Section held its first meeting on October 28th, 1940, in Philadelphia, with further meetings in March, June and October, 1941. The Chairman was Dr. Hugh Thomson Kerr and the Secretary, Dr. Charles W. Lowry. In 1942 they published their report, in which representatives of all the principal confessions had answered a questionnaire about the practice of the several Churches regarding the celebration of the Holy Communion and the terms upon which members of other denominations were admitted to participation.⁴ This extensive activity in the United States was to prove an invaluable contribution to the whole movement when it became possible once more to resume international work.

Meanwhile Dr. Leonard Hodgson conducted such activities as the circumstances of Great Britain in war time allowed. He had been in correspondence with Professor van der Leeuw of Groningen about the chairmanship of the Commission on Ways of Worship, and was to have met him in Amsterdam in June 1940 when the German invasion of the Low Countries in May put an end to all communications between them for some time. Dr. Hodgson therefore set about collecting from such quarters as he could reach a series of papers dealing with the topics in the draft programme of work.⁵

⁴ Faith and Order pamphlet No. 98.

⁵ Faith and Order pamphlet No. 95.

European activity in the Commission on Intercommunion was confined to an enquiry which Dr. Hodgson conducted by correspondence asking for answers to questions similar to those embodied in the American enquiry. The answers to these enquiries were published in January 1944 in a pamphlet entitled 'Rules and Customs of Churches concerning Intercommunion and Open Communion'.⁶

One other step taken during the years of war is worthy of mention. In September 1941, Dr. Hodgson published a circular letter announcing the decision of the Faith and Order Executive to join in the observance of the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity from January 18th to 25th. From 1920 to 1940 the Faith and Order movement had observed the week before Whitsunday (Pentecost) as a special time of prayer for God's blessing on its work. But the period in the third week of January had been growing so widely in its observance in Europe, and in a way which included Roman Catholic participation as well as that of all the bodies associated with Faith and Order, that it was decided not to neglect this opportunity of witness and intercession on the widest possible Christian basis. Ever since 1942 the secretariat of Faith and Order have issued a special call to prayer which has been widely circulated to all parts of the world, inviting prayer for the specific concerns of the Faith and Order movement, but setting them within the wider context of prayer for the unity of the Church of Christ according to the will of Christ.

III

1945-8

In February 1946 the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches called its first post-war meeting in Geneva. Since there was already a considerable overlap in the personnel of those who were involved in that Provisional Committee and in the Executive Committee of Faith and Order, it was natural to call a meeting of the latter, which was held at the headquarters of the World Council on February 20th.⁷ Pastor Boegner took the chair, and one of the first actions of the Committee was to

⁶ Faith and Order pamphlet No. 99.

⁷ For minutes, see Faith and Order pamphlet No. 101.

pay tribute to its former Chairman, who had died towards the end of the war.

It is impossible to estimate the debt of the Faith and Order movement, and of the wider ecumenical movement in which it is set, to Archbishop William Temple. More than any single person, he had contributed to drawing Faith and Order closer to other aspects of ecumenical work by the width of his own personal interests. He had not only been Chairman of the Edinburgh Conference, but had played a prominent part in the Life and Work Conference at Oxford which had immediately preceded it. As Chairman of the negotiating Committee of Thirty-five he had commended the plans for the Council at Edinburgh, and as Chairman of the Committee of Fourteen in the Conference at Utrecht he had not only ensured that the traditions of Faith and Order were fully represented, but had himself been the master architect of the proposed Constitution for the World Council. It was a measure of the man's stature that Faith and Order was only one of a dozen fields in which others felt that they had lost the leader and the counsellor upon whom they greatly depended.

It was not easy to find a successor, and yet it was with deep conviction that this meeting of the Faith and Order Executive invited Dr. Y. Brilioth, then Bishop of Växjö, to take his place.

In 1945 the Rev. O. S. Tomkins had been appointed an Assistant General Secretary under the Provisional Committee of the World Council, and after consultation with various officers of Faith and Order it had been agreed that Mr. Tomkins should also act as Assistant Secretary to Dr. Hodgson in the work of Faith and Order. The other officers continued as before, with Dr. Hodgson as General Secretary and Theological Secretary, and Dr. Floyd Tomkins as Associate Secretary in America. This Executive Committee also heard reports upon the progress being made for each of the three Commissions. Dr. Flew reported that work had begun on the plans laid down at Clarens in 1939; Professor van der Leeuw sent word that he was beginning activity as Chairman of the Commission on Ways of Worship; with regard to intercommunion, it was felt that the factual material presented in the two pamphlets already published should be followed by a theological analysis of the underlying issues, and Professor Donald Baillie of Scotland was asked to be Chairman,

and Professor H. S. Alivisatos of Greece to be Vice-Chairman, of a commission with this purpose.

Meanwhile the provisional organisation of the World Council of Churches was beginning to plan for the World Conference which would officially inaugurate the Council. One of the four subjects to be considered by that first Assembly concerned the nature of the Church. But it was felt that the existing programme of work in the Faith and Order Continuation Committee was so heavy as to make it impracticable to divert time and energy to setting up a special commission in preparation for the Assembly, so it was agreed that liaison should be maintained through the fact that Mr. Tomkins was acting as Secretary of the Assembly Preparatory Commission on 'The Universal Church in God's Design', and that among the members of that Commission were many who played an active part in the work of Faith and Order.

The Continuation Committee met again at Clarens from August 28th to September 1st 1947.⁸ At this meeting, further progress reports were made on the work of the three Commissions, and (as was the general practice at meetings of the Continuation Committee) theological papers were read as examples of the work that was being done in these fields. Two men who had been closely associated with Faith and Order in the past resigned their offices at this stage, and thanks were recorded for all that had been done by Mr. W. Rodman Parvin and Canon Tissington Tatlow as Acting Treasurers for the movement in the United States and in Europe. The Committee ratified the proposals for fuller integration of Faith and Order within the World Council of Churches by coming into it as its Commission on Faith and Order from the time of the first Assembly.

Thus the last meeting of the Continuation Committee known under that name was held at Amsterdam on Saturday 21st August 1948, with Dr. Brilioth for the first time in the chair.⁹ The business was principally to give formal approval to the arrangements whereby Faith and Order became part of the World Council and to accept a draft Constitution in which these proposals were embodied. On September 7th and 8th 1948 Dr. Brilioth presided over the first meeting of World Council's Commission on Faith and Order.⁹ As a result of action taken by the first Assembly

⁸ For minutes, see Faith and Order papers No. 102.

⁹ Faith and Order papers Old Series No. 103, New Series No. 1.

of the World Council the officers of the Commission were now Dr. Brilioth as Chairman, Bishop Aulén, Pastor Marc Boegner, Dr. Newton Flew, Archbishop Germanos and Dr. Douglas Horton as Vice-chairmen; the Secretary was the Rev. O. S. Tomkins (who had also been appointed by the Assembly as one of the Associate General Secretaries of the Council); Dr. Leonard Hodgson was Theological Secretary, and Dr. Floyd W. Tomkins, Associate Secretary in America. The new Constitution, as discussed on August 21st, had been considered by the World Council's Central Committee, which proposed certain minor amendments, and the Faith and Order Commission accepted a draft (printed in the minutes of this meeting) which was finally adopted also by a subsequent meeting of the Central Committee.

A word at this stage should be devoted to the Report of Section I of the Amsterdam Assembly.¹⁰ Although, as has been indicated, this was not officially an activity of the Faith and Order Commission, its subject was wholly in the tradition of Faith and Order thought, and many of those who contributed to the formulation of the report had long been working and thinking together under the auspices of the Faith and Order movement. The outstanding characteristic of the Report was its recognition that, in spite of many qualifications which must be made in any such analysis, a deep division exists between Christians in their apprehension of the nature of the Church. It defines 'our deepest difference' as being 'loosely described as the difference between "catholic" and "protestant"', and goes on:

'It is impossible to describe either tendency or emphasis briefly without doing it an injustice. Each contains within it a wide variety of emphasis and many "schools of thought". But in each case we confront a whole corporate tradition of the understanding of Christian faith and life. We may illustrate this by saying that the emphasis usually called "catholic" contains a primary insistence upon the visible continuity of the Church in the apostolic succession of the episcopate. The one usually called "protestant" primarily emphasises the initiative of the Word of God and the response of faith, focussed in the doctrine of justification *sola fide*. But the first group also

¹⁰ *The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches: The Official Report*, pp. 51-7.

stresses faith, and the second also stresses continuity of the visible Church in some form. Moreover this difference of emphasis cuts across many of our confessional boundaries.'

This distinction was widely challenged and discussed after the Conference, but it is interesting to compare with it the series of antitheses which later appeared in the closing parts of the Report of Dr. Newton Flew's Theological Commission on the Church (see below).

IV

1948-52

The end of the Continuation Committee and the beginning of the Faith and Order Commission made no real difference to the way in which Faith and Order work was prosecuted. The personnel remained largely unchanged except for vacancies caused by death or retirement, and the plans made by the Continuation Committee for the Theological Commissions, and the budgets for their maintenance, continued as before. The change was one of addition and not of loss. From the moment of the inauguration of the Faith and Order Commission, the work of Faith and Order was related not only to the individuals who had hitherto comprised its committees and through them to the Churches from which they came. As a constituent part of the Council, Faith and Order concerns now appeared regularly upon the agenda of the World Council's Central Committee, and the Secretary of Faith and Order was charged with relating the Faith and Order tradition to all the other departments of the World Council, without any infringement of the freedom of his own.

A full meeting of the Faith and Order Commission was held at Chichester from July 16th to 20th 1949.¹¹ It was at this meeting that Dr. Brilioth told the Commission that he was able to report having received from Dr. Nygren, Bishop of Lund, an invitation to hold the next Conference on Faith and Order at Lund, which would be an eminently suitable centre. It was agreed to accept the invitation, and to ask the World Council's Central Committee to authorise the holding of the Third World Conference on Faith and Order at Lund in 1952. It was decided that since World

¹¹ F.O.C. papers No. 2.

Council Assemblies now brought together church leaders on a big scale, a World Conference on Faith and Order could afford to be smaller than in the past, and that the Lund Conference should consist of some 200 to 250 delegates, with a small proportion of consultants. When the Executive Committee met at Bièvres near Paris in September 1950¹² the consent of the Central Committee to the holding of the Lund Conference had been obtained, and the 1948 Constitution for Faith and Order had been accepted by the World Council's Central Committee meeting at Toronto. The Bièvres Executive was thus able to proceed with drafting the official letter of invitation to the Churches to send their representatives to a Third World Conference on Faith and Order.

The meeting of the Commission at Chichester included the usual reports on progress from the secretariat and from the officers of the three preparatory Commissions. But the item which was to make a new contribution to preparations for Lund was a letter from Professor C. H. Dodd which the Secretary read to the Commission. His own report had referred to the fact that a report entitled 'Non-theological Factors in the Making and Unmaking of Church Union', in preparation for the Edinburgh Conference, had not there received adequate attention. But any realistic estimate of why Christians were divided must reckon with that range of facts. Consequently he had invited Professor Dodd (who was unable to be present at the meeting) to put on paper some of his ideas on the subject. Professor Dodd's letter was subsequently widely published, not only in the minutes of the Chichester meeting, but also in the *Ecumenical Review* and in the general survey of Faith and Order work later published by the Secretary under the title *The Church in the Purpose of God*.¹³

The subject, rephrased as 'Social and Cultural Factors in Church Divisions', was discussed in conferences organised by the American Faith and Order Committee, and finally in November 1951 a conference was organised at the Ecumenical Institute of the World Council at the Château de Bossey in Switzerland. Three representatives of the American Committee were present at it, and a number of historians, economists, psychologists, etc., as well as professional theologians, from many parts of Europe and

¹² F.O.C. papers No. 4.

¹³ F.O.C. papers No. 3; also published by the S.C.M. Press.

from Britain. As a result of their conference one of the preparatory papers for the Lund Conference¹⁴ was published for circulation to all participants in the Lund Conference as well as for public sale. This brochure included Professor Dodd's original letter, two papers read at the conference, one from Canada and one from France, as well as the report compiled by the conference itself under the title 'Non-theological factors that may hinder or accelerate the Church's Unity'. Owing to the late stage in the preparations at which these issues had been raised, no special theological commission was appointed, nor was the subject made into a fourth topic for the Conference itself. But, as can be seen from Chapter 5 in Part III of this volume, and from the Lund Conference Report itself, the whole Conference was mindful of these factors throughout its discussions.

The three preparatory Theological Commissions were continuing steadily with their work. At the Chichester meeting, Professor Craig, in the absence of Dr. Flew, reported on the progress of the Commission on the Church, which at that stage still had hopes of producing four volumes of essays as suggested in the original plan. A full meeting of the Commission had been held under the chairmanship of Dr. Flew just before the Chichester meeting, at which special attention had been given to the drafts for Volume III—the statements of official confessional doctrine regarding the Church. The first two projected volumes—essays sketching the biblical doctrine of the Church and its development in history—were not so far advanced, and in fact it proved impossible for these two volumes to be published at all before the Lund Conference. The fourth volume is that to which we shall have occasion to refer below as the final report of this Commission.

On Ways of Worship, Professor van der Leeuw read a report which he had prepared on his own responsibility, since his Commission was not holding a full meeting until after the Chichester committee. But it was agreed on his request that the original field of study should be narrowed owing to the shortness of time available. The whole question of hymnology in worship and the problems for worship created by the ecumenical movement itself were left over.

¹⁴ *Social and Cultural Factors in Church Divisions*, F.O.C. papers No. 10; also published by the S.C.M. Press.

Professor Baillie reported that the Commission on Intercommunion had held brief meetings at Chichester itself. Three American members had been added to his Commission, which thus became representative of both sides of the Atlantic. The volume of essays which they planned was to comprise a series of essays dealing with the history of intercommunion from the early Church down to the present time, and theological essays on principles underlying varying practices.

All three of the preparatory Commissions planned to hold full meetings during the summer of 1950 to draft their reports. This was done, and by the end of 1951 all three reports were completed and were published as the main preparatory material sent to all participants in the Lund Conference, as well as being available for public sale in their English editions.¹⁵ Separate editions were produced in German, and in French a special number of the periodical *Foi et Vie* published a version of the Secretary's preparatory book (which gave a survey of the subject matter of all three Commissions) under the title *L'Eglise dans le Dessein de Dieu*.

The last full meeting of the Commission before Lund was held at Clarens from August 13th to 17th 1951.¹⁶ Two principal matters engaged its attention, apart from the reports on progress from the Theological Commissions: (a) the final drafting of the detailed programme for the Lund Conference itself, and (b) the drawing up of proposals for the structure of the Faith and Order Commission after the Lund Conference as a fully integrated part of the World Council of Churches. Neither needs much description here, for the final fruits of each appear in the chapters which follow.

Three volumes of essays, supporting and illuminating the short reports just referred to, were published in English during the winter and spring of 1951-2.¹⁷ Although the economic difficulties involved in producing German and French editions were insurmountable, there is good evidence that these books were fairly widely read before the Conference, and have since secured

¹⁵ F.O.C. papers Nos. 5, 6 and 7; also published by the S.C.M. Press.

¹⁶ F.O.C. papers No. 8.

¹⁷ *Viz.* *The Church*, ed. by R. N. Flew; *Intercommunion*, ed. by D. Baillie and J. Marsh; *Ways of Worship*, ed. by E. Hayman, P. Edwall and W. D. Maxwell, S.C.M. Press, 21s. each.

a place, along with their predecessors in the Faith and Order tradition, as standard works of reference.

In 1952 there was held only a meeting of the Executive Committee¹⁸ immediately before a meeting at Lambeth Palace of the World Council's Executive Committee. At this Lambeth meeting the finishing touches were put to all the plans for the Conference, and to the memorandum on the future organisation of Faith and Order. The latter was subsequently discussed by a joint committee representing the Executive Committees both of the Central Committee and of the Faith and Order Commission, which agreed upon the memorandum which is printed in Chapter 7 of Part III of this volume.

No further committees were held until the Executive Committee held a brief meeting at Lund on the day preceding the opening of the Third World Conference.

¹⁸ F.O.C. papers No. 9.

Part Three

THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONFERENCE

CHAPTER I

THE OPENING SERVICE

held in the Cathedral at 8 p.m. on Friday, August 15th.



Throughout the Conference, its life was inestimably enriched by the loveliness of the Cathedral in which daily worship was held. The participants had their first corporate experience of this glorious Romanesque building as they assembled, together with hundreds of Swedish friends, for the opening service.

The service opened with a prelude on the great organ and the singing together of 'Ein Feste Burg'. The form of worship was led by Bishop Ivan Lee Holt (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), who had been invited to take the place of Dean C. T. Craig, prevented by illness from attending the conference.¹ The first lesson (Isa. 40.1-10, 27-31) was read in French by Professor d'Espine, and the second lesson (Eph. 4.1-16) in German, by Bishop Lilje.

The congregation then recited together the Gloria Patri and the Apostles' Creed and were led in prayers of confession, thanksgiving and intercession. The hymns 'Dear Lord and Father of mankind' preceded, and 'Lo! He comes in clouds descending' followed the two sermons (printed below) and the service closed with the benediction.

SERMON BY BISHOP LAKDASA DE MEL, KURUNAGALA, CEYLON

But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me: And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning. (John 15.26-7.)

God in His providence has brought us together this day—in spite of the absence of some whom we would long to have with us—to wait humbly upon the Holy Spirit for further guidance into the Truth as it is in Christ Jesus, that the witness of the One,

¹ The death of Dean Craig on 19th August 1953 was a sad loss to all Faith and Order work.

Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church might be more acceptable to the Saviour who came to redeem all the nations upon earth. We are come to hearken with open ears and hearts. The ecumenical movement, modern in origin, has of course its own definite character, but this conference follows in a great and venerable tradition. Synods and Councils have always been held in the Church in order that the experience of different places and the wisdom of different persons being brought together, the Spirit of truth may teach His servants thus assembled, what they have not learned apart from one another.

As we move on to our discussion of Faith and Order, there will be the inevitable tensions and differences of emphasis: but God can make them fruitful, for we come together as those who by virtue of One Baptism are already caught up into a unity which we are being called upon to make more active and intimate in a world full of strife. Let us pray that the vigilance of the trained theologian will not only look for fuller light, but that God may use this conference to give some expression of and encouragement to the mute aspirations of the simple and untutored, the common people who heard the Lord gladly—for they understood Him, who spake as man never spake. God grant to us an urgent sense of His concern for their yearning for peace and quietness, and a vision of what a Church, united in the fullness of time, can do for a divided world. And then, when vision is granted to us, there must follow the penitence and self-surrender which go to make obedience.

To-day, August 15th, the Dormitio, being the oldest feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary, many here will give thanks to God for the example of great obedience for which all generations shall call her Blessed. In a world which relies so much on the arm of flesh, we here assembled may appear of small account: but He whose good pleasure it is to put down the mighty from their seat and to exalt the humble and meek, will surely overshadow us with the Holy Spirit if we are pure in heart. Heavenly vision demands also obedience to God's plan. 'And to whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required.'

On the eve of our conference it is most fitting to look back to the faithful obedience of those who, having bequeathed to us the ecumenical movement, are now numbered among the great cloud of witnesses beyond the veil. Amongst them, in this place it is

peculiarly fitting to give thanks for that great servant of God, Nathan Söderblom, Archbishop of Uppsala. May they rest in peace.

All over the world to-day, faithful multitudes are praying that the Spirit of God may guide us on the vital matters we are to discuss. Our discussions on Faith and Order, if they are not to be purely academic, should be leading us forth along the path of the Church's unity.

If a representative of the Younger Churches who is deeply grateful for all that the missionaries have done for us may say a word in love to those who have been used of God to send us Holy Baptism, it would be along these lines:

(1) We are now much more fully alive to our responsibilities and opportunities in our own lands. Far more than any material gift, we of the Younger Churches need from you the gift of prayerful understanding and trustfulness. Your very love and concern for us can breed possessiveness in two spheres. In the material, there is the temptation to cling to property or institutions long after the local Church has passed the stage of adolescence. In the spiritual, there is the temptation to excessive fear that syncretism will corrupt our faith and cause fresh divisions. The parent Churches seek to build us up into a pattern—either the first four centuries, the thirteenth, or the sixteenth. We must learn from all these, but such patterns are partly dated and inadequate. We must look to the future, to a Church which includes territories and peoples then unknown to Christendom, and therefore to a future capable of a fullness and a wholeness hitherto unimagined. It will not do to look back to a golden age prior to tragic happenings; or to invest some reforming period with such exaggerated importance as almost to suggest a second revelation in place of that which was given uniquely to those to whom our Blessed Lord said: 'And ye also bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning.' We must look forward under the guidance of the Holy Spirit to a Church more glorious and complete than has ever been, even before the tragic breakdown in unity. We adore a God who can use disaster to bring about a triumph the more glorious, because of the extent of that disaster. The Cross and Resurrection are the measure of God's power. May the Holy Spirit bring this to pass, even though the time and the season may be hidden from us. The pattern we must all work to is the vision of the future which the ecumenical movement is being used of God to give us.

(2) We desire church unity primarily because it is the will of our Lord. In this matter the parent Churches must resist the temptation to measure everything by their own standards. We well realise that the hope for a united Church lies in maintaining all those elements of Faith and Order which were the fundamentals of the Church before that unity was broken by the sins of men who could not maintain those elements in a just balance. Let it, however, be remembered that unprecedented situations cannot be dealt with in every detail by the precedents of church history; and further, where all the fruits of visible union cannot be had at the inception of a scheme of union, our friends in the West must for the peace of the Church apply a self-denying ordinance to themselves in certain particulars, especially where they expect more of us than they are ready to demand of themselves. Better still, the inevitable crop of anomalies would be much reduced if your influence could be used to encourage similar schemes of union amongst yourselves and your own kindred overseas. While we appreciate the place of honour given to Asia to occupy in such creative tasks, we ourselves must guard our honour against the possibility of our services to Christian unity being mistaken for a by-product of Asian nationalism. Many doubts and hesitations may be resolved if a number of similar schemes, affecting a wider variety of peoples and continents, could be brought to fruition about the same time. Synchronisation, were this possible, would greatly reduce the number of anomalies and confusions. Many will say, 'How can these things be?' but remember, 'The wind bloweth where it listeth'.

And then, from the vision of the Church's unity, we must go on to behold in the mind's eye the glorious prospect of world evangelisation, wherein the redemption wrought by Christ is told forth throughout the whole of the earth. World-wide materialism has given to the Church in all lands a very similar task. The problem we have to face is a common one. In this there is no distinction between the older and the younger parts of the Church. Our task is one. Only a Church filled with the Holy Spirit can give an answer to the predicament of modern man. We must trust in the Living God and lay hold on His Grace through prayer.

We need grace to speak truth in love and humbly to acknowledge our transgressions before God and to one another. We need

grace to overcome the tiredness and lack of serenity with which a troubled world infects us. We need grace to serve the Church more faithfully and to suffer with her as she goes forth to bring the glory of the nations into the Kingdom of God by building up all flesh into the sacred humanity of Jesus Christ.

Come then Holy Spirit, Lord and Life-giver! Come and abide with us and save us from our sins. Let the celestial fire enlighten us, may the rushing mighty wind stir up fresh power within us, and send us into the Babel of this world's confusion with the reconciling message of Pentecost wherein all races shall hear in their own tongues the wonderful works of God.

SERMON BY GENERALSUPERINTENDENT
DR. GÜNTER JACOB

(translated from the German)

Listen, O isles, unto me; and hearken, ye people, from far; The Lord hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name. And he hath made my mouth like a sharp sword; in the shadow of his hand hath he hid me, and made me a polished shaft; in his quiver hath he hid me; And said unto me, Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified. Then I said, I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength for nought, and in vain; yet surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work with my God. And now, saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him, Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength. And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth. (Isa. 49.1-6.)

Two thousand five hundred years ago, the Lord of the Church gave the message that is spoken of in our text, to His people in the time of the Babylonian captivity, in a time of deepest tribulation and in a most dangerous state of confusion, in an hour of pitiful failure, guilt and ruin. That world of 2,500 years ago has fallen into decay long ago. Those nations are dead. Their gigantic buildings and mighty monuments are 'gone with the wind'. But the voice of the Lord of the Church breaks

through the stones and walls of centuries, of millenniums. His voice that addressed the people 2,500 years ago strikes our mind to-day with the primary power of His sacred Word, speaks to the Christendom of our world, 1952. The servant who proclaims here quite openly God's Word before the vast world, before the isles and people in the far distance, is Israel imprisoned at that time in Babylon. Israel for us, seen in the light of the New Testament, is the archetype of the true Israel, the Church of Jesus Christ. Israel is we ourselves, the ministers and members of Christ's community who from all parts of the earth are here together as the representatives of world-wide Christendom to listen in common to the message and service that we have to fulfil in these dark and tumultuous times, in this hour of our weakness and danger, of our piteous failure, and we submit to God's voice.

What then, 2,500 years ago, is meant in the prophet's word, is addressed to us Christians of the year 1952, to God's servants in this our hour. That time is comparable in every sense of the word to our time when we, the Christendom of to-day, have to experience what Israel had to experience under the dictatorship of the powerful Babylonian world, under the tyranny of foreign views, when divided into communities on the ground of Jerusalem and into persecuted communities under the sovereignty of the Babylonian State. The Israel of that time has left behind a history of great confusions and terrible apostasy. And God's voice calls upon that people: 'Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I sent?' (Isa. 42.19). And in another passage of our prophet's book Israel is described as plundered and pillaged, kidnapped and imprisoned in a dismal dark jail. As to the history of failure and disloyalty, Israel is reproachfully asked: 'Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers? Did not the Lord, he against whom we have sinned?' (Isa. 42.24). Israel at that time was involved in vast upheavals, was powerless in international relationships, in a world of sheet lightning and war explosions, in revolutionary crises, weak and powerless when political tensions between East and West tore the world asunder and where the slogans of world powers echoed. Israel then was badly tempted to waver between treacherous hope to expect the near hour of liberation by world-wide political events, and in despair to be a perishing and dying Church under the dictatorship of the Babylonian world power. The Israel of that time, in a mood

of deepest weariness and resignation, was on the point of capitulating with the words of our text: 'I said, I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength for nought, and in vain' (Isa. 49.4).

Indeed, the hour of the world-wide Christendom of to-day is similar to that of 2,500 years ago, the time of the Babylonian captivity. In our own time the Church of Jesus Christ lives in vast areas of the earth under the dictatorship of world powers and the tyranny of unmistakably foreign views of life. To-day, too, Christendom on earth is torn asunder and split by political powers. To-day, too, we have a Christendom with a history of disorder and terrific apostasy, we pass through a history of divisions and cleavages, of disharmony between each other and disloyalty towards the one Lord of the Church. And the Lord's voice also calls upon us: 'Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I sent?' And seeing the whole misery and weakness of our Christendom, in disunity and discord, we too have to listen to the voice asking: ' . . . Did not the Lord, He against whom we have sinned?' The world-wide Church to which we belong and that we confess is without any power in the field of international powers, powerless in her service and witness in a time echoing loud and tumultuously with the orders of the great world powers. We too, as members of the world-wide Church, are badly tempted to turn hither and thither between the hope soon to see a turning-point through vast political events and the gloomy despair to be shattered in the conflict with alien viewpoints and foreign doctrines of salvation. We too, as the Church of Jesus Christ, stand in great temptation to capitulate, feeling our innermost needs, being aware of our still unsolved dogmatic divisions and the diversity of our political standpoints; indeed, we are greatly tempted to capitulate in this mood of deep weariness and resignation, uttering the words: 'I said, I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength for nought, and in vain.' And who among us does not suffer from such a complaint when he calmly considers the state of Christendom in our own world, of course not only in those parts where the growth of the Church of Jesus Christ has been totally shattered by the impact of an alien yoke?

But in the very hour of darkness, misery and danger 2,500 years ago, the poor powerless Church was thought worthy by the Lord of the Church, worthy of being called upon as God's

servant, in spite of all failures and guilt in the past, in spite of all weakness and wretchedness in the present, to be *the* Church in a world-wide service. And therefore we too are allowed to be chosen as a poor and powerless Church by our Lord in the dark, gloomy and endangered hour of to-day, to become God's minister among the people of our own time, God's servant with the holy promise included in the following words of our text: 'It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel. I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth' (Isa. 49.6).

Thus the Church of 2,500 years ago in that dark hour during the Babylonian captivity was given the privilege of experiencing in quite a new fashion what we, too, in our time are given quite newly to experience: that the Church as God's servant lives only by the calling of her Lord. Our text says: 'The Lord hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name' (Isa. 49.1). The Church as God's servant has her life and message only from the mystery of His choosing. Let us consider anew this our choosing and calling as Christ's Church and as God's minister in these days of our meeting. In such joint consideration our eyes shall be turned beyond all differences in traditions, beyond all peculiarities of historical experience, but also beyond all tensions of a genuine struggle about dogmatic knowledge, towards the Lord of the Church, Jesus Christ who expresses the mystery of His choosing in the following lines: 'Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you' (John 15.16). In this hour of our great confusions and tribulations it is a true comfort for us that we have assembled here not to build up with all our strength a united front of Churches, but to hear from His very mouth that we might be the Church from the very first beginning, the Church as God's servant under the mystery of choosing and calling by the one Lord whom we all confess—in spite of all our failure and all our guilt, in spite of all our weakness and littleness—Jesus Christ who in the days of the Apostles created His community on earth.

We are God's ministers as Jesus Christ's Church in all the

world. 'Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified' (Isa. 49.3). Israel hears it in the hour of its tattered condition and Babylonian captivity in a gloomy world. Literally translated: 'Thou art my servant, in whom I glorify.' Thus we must understand it to-day as a Christian community assembled from all over the world in the present hour of our state of disorder and Babylonian captivity in the darkened world of the year 1952. 'Thou art my servant, in whom I glorify.' I wish that through all the joint deliberations and all our joint life in the church services during these days, through all the differences and tensions that worry us, we were able to listen anew to this Word of our Lord and comprehend it as a calling to all of us, to the world-wide Church of to-day. We ought to be God's servant, God's slave, God's serf. In Luke 12, Jesus Christ describes the plight of the Church in the world in a symbol: servants who are waiting for their master in the night, are ready to welcome their master, their bridegroom. Christ's Church is here pictured as a brotherhood of Christ's servants who are not asleep in the depth of the night and who do not run away, but remain together, who are awake and ready for the coming of their master. Let us remember anew in this dark hour of our world that we are to be the Lord's servants, a brotherhood of the watchful Church of Christ. This passage in St. Luke's Gospel tells distinctly what claim the Lord of the Church lays on our whole life and on all the lives of our communities. As servants we have to be obedient to our one Lord. As servants we are not permitted to run away from the obedience that is due to our one Lord, we must not desert to another body of followers. As Christians we have only to obey the voice of Christ and be deaf to the voices of other masters and powers though they may try to lure us with tempting offers, even with brutal threatenings to engage us in their service. As God's servant, the Christian Church is bound with all its existence to the faithfulness of its Lord. Nevertheless, is it free in such a bondage, free in the primary sense of the word, free from all the other masters and powers that press around it?

As the Lord's servant the Church of Jesus Christ is not only called to simple faithfulness and unconditional obedience towards its Lord, but as such it can always be aware of its Lord's faithfulness and protection as well as of His loving care. As the Lord's servants we may consider ourselves to be all sheltered in the

keeping of the one Lord who in truth is the Lord of all. Thus we are free from all anxiety caused by other powers that may crowd round us with their offers or even their threats. Being Christ's servants we cannot be servants of worldly powers, their ideologies and programmes, servants of a certain nation, a race, of West or East. 'Thou art my servant, in whom I glorify.' This word addressed by God 2,500 years ago to the poor, separated and powerless Israel at the time of captivity is spoken to us to-day by the Lord of the Churches for our comfort and exhortation. Do we not know that Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Church, is only glorified in suffering? Christ's glory is only visible in the handcuffs of the fettered victim, in the humble steps of the tortured Christ on His way to Golgotha under the abuse of the crowds, in the prayers of the dying Christ for His tormentors, His executioners. Again His glory becomes visible in the suffering of the Apostles in their prison cells and in the suffering of the martyrs of whole centuries who, in the hour of uttermost torture, defeated their enemies with prayer and praise in their hearts. In the same way may Christ also be glorified in our time in our weakness and defeats, in our praising Him in deepest need, in our prayer for those who harry us. Certainly it is a sign not to be misinterpreted and a call not to be misunderstood in the present time: God causes His Church to go the same way of suffering. For it is in the suffering Church that the Lord is glorified in the sight of the world and its mighty ones, Christ whose highest glorification on the Cross in the deepest shame is confessed by us and worshipped.

Since the same promise, which Israel received 2,500 years ago in a time full of guilt and sin, was granted to the Lord's Church, so can our Church to-day be nothing but God's brotherhood of Christ and receives a twofold promise which we in the days of the World Council of Churches will accept with joy to quicken our work and to help us on our way. God's servant was promised that he was to raise Jacob's tribes and restore the Remnant in Israel. The Lord's servant of 1952 is promised that all estrangement and all tensions between us shall be conquered, not by the invention of compromising theological formulae, not that under the atmospheric pressure we unite from convenient or practical reasons, but that we are told anew by the Lord of the Church, we who have come to meet here: 'Thou art my servant, in whom

I will be glorified.' We are the brotherhood of Christ's servants, awake in the dark of night and preparing to be ready for the coming of our Lord. The second promise given to God's servant is that he is made to be the light to illuminate the whole of mankind and to be God's salvation unto the end of the earth. If we are God's servant in simple faithfulness and unconditional obedience towards God our Lord, if we are the brotherhood of Christ's servants who watch together in this dark hour of the world, if we as the suffering Church are exalting and extolling God at midnight, praying without bitterness for those who persecute us—then Jesus Christ's light will also to-day illuminate the darkened world and will become visible in a sacred glow all over the earth.

Our service as the Church in a world torn asunder by deep tensions and in disharmony caused by passion and hatred, will be the true service of Christ's brotherhood, will go forward on the way of suffering obedience towards our Lord and in humble love for our fellow men, even for our enemies, as wakeful servants who are ready for the coming of their Lord at this midnight hour of the world. Thus speaks the Lord to us to-day in His Holy Word: 'Thou art my servant, in whom I will be glorified.'

NOTE ON CONFERENCE WORSHIP

This is an appropriate point at which to note that the regular daily worship of the Conference in the Cathedral comprised a short service at 9.30 a.m. on every week-day, led, each according to his own tradition, by delegates from a wide range of confessions and nations. Similarly, evening prayers were held at 9.45 p.m., taking the form either of Compline or of a time of free prayer under the leadership of a delegate. The names of those who led the worship, morning and evening, were as follows:

Mornings

August 16th: Dr. R. J. McCracken (American Baptist Convention).
 August 18th: Unitätsdirektor Lic. H. Renkewitz (Moravian Church).
 August 19th: Canon F. E. Maynard (Church of England in Australia).
 August 20th: Professor G. Florovsky (Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople; Exarchate for Russians in the West).

- August 21st: Dr. Howard H. Brinton (Society of Friends, Philadelphia, U.S.A.).
- August 22nd: M. le pasteur Pierre Maury (Reformed Church of France).
- August 23rd: Rev. Dr. Oscar T. Olson (Methodist Church, U.S.A.).
- August 25th: Most Rev. Metropolitan Juhanon Mar Thoma (Mar Thoma Church, South India).
- August 26th: Bishop A. Bereczky (Reformed Church of Hungary).
- August 27th: Rev. S. Duraikhan (Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, India).
- August 28th: Dr. Leslie E. Cooke (Congregational Union of England and Wales).

Evenings

- August 18th: Compline. Bishop Riches.
- August 19th: Prayers. Rev. Irvonwy Morgan.
- August 20th: Compline (in French). Frère Max Thurian.
- August 21st: Prayers. Dr. J. Newton Thomas.
- August 22nd: Compline. Rev. Martii Parvio.
- August 23rd: Prayers. Rev. H. V. White.
- August 25th: Compline (in German). Dr. H. H. Harms.
- August 26th: Compline. Mr. Joseph Mangalam (of the Youth Group, who decided to use Compline on this occasion).
- August 27th: Compline. Bishop A. J. Allen.

Services were printed in three languages for distribution to the congregation whenever this was possible. Sometimes a form was followed from the tri-lingual service book of the World's Student Christian Federation, *Venite Adoremus*, Vol. I, which includes Compline. The hymn book used throughout was *Cantate Domino*, also published by the W.S.C.F., with hymns in at least English, French and German versions.

CHAPTER 2

THE CONFERENCE OPENS AND SURVEYS ITS TASK



The Opening Session, 10 a.m., Saturday, August 16th

The meeting opened with the singing of the hymn 'O God, our help in ages past'. Dr. Newton Flew then mounted the rostrum and addressed the conference.

DR. FLEW. The first business of this conference is to elect its president. As soon as the conference assembled, the Executive Committee expired—in fact, it expired yesterday—but it has entrusted me, as one of the vice-chairmen of the Faith and Order Commission, with the honour of conveying to the conference their unanimous and enthusiastic nomination of the leader whom they think should be elected President.

Archbishop Brilioth has guided the Continuation Committee since the death of William Temple, and he has been much admired for the consummate skill, wisdom and self-effacing modesty, not without shafts of dry humour, with which he has led the Committee. He is always most at home when leading others in the deepest things of our most holy faith, and he has had experience of the Faith and Order movement for more than thirty years. When elected he will stand in a succession both impressive and encouraging. The first World Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne in 1927 had as its president that heroic missionary, Bishop Brent of the American Protestant Episcopal Church, whose name commanded universal respect and veneration. Archbishop Brilioth once said of him that Bishop Brent carried with him in his manifold activities that strange, lucid serenity which was one of the marks of holiness. He burnt himself out in his zeal for Faith and Order, whose creator and inspirer he has been. Shortly after 1927 he died in the very city in which he had presided over the Faith and Order conference.

William Temple was likewise a saint whom I have loved and venerated ever since I attended his first course of lectures at Oxford—on Plato's *Republic*—forty-five years ago. I can say nothing finer of any man than that all the members of the Executive Committee, most of whom knew William Temple intimately, count Archbishop Brilioth as worthy to succeed him. It is many years since Archbishop Brilioth studied in England and gave the fruit of his studies in his masterly work on the Eucharist. He has been counted worthy among his own countrymen to succeed Archbishop Eidem, who is remembered with affection, and before him Archbishop Söderblom, from whom he has inherited that passion for the unity of Christ's broken Church which is indispensable in Faith and Order work. He comes before this meeting in his own mother country both as a leader and a host. He has invited the delegates to his lovely country, and has done everything in his power to make them feel at home.

Dr. Flew then formally nominated Archbishop Brilioth as President of the Conference, and this was approved unanimously and by acclamation. Turning to Archbishop Brilioth, Dr. Flew then prayed in the words of the Aaronic blessing:

‘The Lord bless thee and keep thee,
The Lord make His face to shine upon thee
and be gracious unto thee,
The Lord lift up His countenance upon thee
and give thee peace.’

Archbishop Brilioth expressed his thanks to the conference for the great mark of confidence which had been shown him and for Dr. Newton Flew's kind words. These added to his feeling of inadequacy for the task, and he asked the conference's tolerance, particularly for limitations which would derive from the fact that he would not be using his own language. There were also differences in procedure between his and other countries, and he asked that a spirit of kindness and forbearance might prevail in the conference.

Archbishop Brilioth then stated that it was the custom to elect a vice-president for such a conference and, on behalf of the executive Committee, he had great pleasure in nominating Dr. Douglas Horton of the Congregational Christian Churches of America for that office. Dr. Horton was unanimously elected vice-president. Archbishop Brilioth's presidential address followed.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

It is indeed a solemn moment when the third World Conference on Faith and Order begins its deliberations in this city of Lund.

We, who are here assembled from many lands, have behind us a great tradition. It is forty-two years since, after the International Missionary Conference of Edinburgh, the inspiration came to Bishop Charles Brent to propose to the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States to invite all Christian Churches, which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, to consider in conference matters of Faith and Order, in order to discover, in a spirit of unity and with a will to understand, the real disagreements which are obstacles to reunion and those things on which a real agreement exists between all those who profess and call themselves Christians.

We cannot meet together without thanking God for those prophets and leaders who have called forth the movement in which we stand. The transparent sincerity and the burning zeal of Charles Brent have left on this enterprise an indelible imprint. If we are to be faithful to his memory, and to the memory of his great successor, William Temple, we should by all means strive to speak the truth in love, as before the face of God, and to keep before our inner eyes the vision of the one Church of Christ—even when this vision seems to recede to a remote distance, even beyond the horizon of temporal history.

We should remember to-day with veneration and gratitude those who have laboured in this cause, but have now left the earthly scene. We cannot here present a complete roll of honour. But I must venture to mention a few names, as they occur to me: the faithful friends and helpers of Bishop Brent, Robert Hallowell Gardiner and George Zabriskie; Dr. A. E. Garvie, vice-chairman both in Lausanne and Edinburgh; Professor Adolf Deissmann; Generalsuperintendent Wilhelm Zoellner; Pasteur Merle d'Aubigné; Archbishop Nathan Söderblom; Dr. William Adams Brown; Dean H. N. Bate; Bishop W. T. Manning; Bishop A. C. Headlam; Dr. J. Ross Stevenson; Professor S. Boulgakow; Professor Nicolai Glubokovskij; Professor Eugène Choisy; Archbishop Germanos; Bishop Azariah of Dornakal; Baron Harald Bildt; Archbishop Lehtonen; Professor Gerardus van der Leeuw.

May we, in a moment of silence, remember those who have fought the good fight, finished their course, kept their faith.

Requiescant in pace, et lux perpetua luceat eis.

Few are those here present who preserve memories from the first tentative gathering in Geneva in 1920. Not many remember through personal experience the Lausanne Conference of 1927. 'We are here at the urgent behest of Jesus Christ. We have come with willing feet.' These are the opening words of the sermon preached by Brent at the opening of that conference. Nearer in time is the Edinburgh Conference of 1937, but still remote, not so much through the number of years, but above all through the apocalyptic events which have brought about one of the greatest crises in the history of mankind. It has been in the course of time one of the privileges of the Christian Church to bridge over the chasms in the history of our civilisation, and to preserve in times of turmoil and bewilderment a continuity, a holy tradition that cannot be broken by wars and revolutions, revolutions of war and social upheaval or revolutions in the realm of thought. It is our hope that it may be given to us to perform in this epoch a service similar to that which the Church performed at the end of the ancient world. This gives to the task of the whole ecumenical movement and also to our task a still greater importance, and a still deeper significance, that we are called to carry on, under present conditions, that quest for unity which was begun before the great upheaval. It is a task which confronts each individual Church. But that we are permitted to pursue it in common, with a common responsibility and a common hope, is a gift from the God of history which makes our responsibility greater, but also our hope more secure. The tradition of a single Church may be broken. But the united endeavour of all the Churches which take part in our movement has a greater power of endurance. If they all strive to be faithful to their heritage, and to preserve the values which they together hold in trust for future generations, they will help each other and they will together build the bridge from one historical epoch to another. But the faithfulness which is required of them is above all the faithfulness to their living Lord.

It is not possible here to tell the whole history of our movement, to enumerate the meetings of the continuation committees, and to present a list of the reports which have been published. The story of Faith and Order will be a chapter of particular importance

in the great work on the history of the Ecumenical Movement which is being prepared.¹ It is a story with which those who share in the movement should make themselves acquainted. The main facts are ably presented in the booklet by Mr. Oliver Tomkins which has been sent out. Nor shall I here attempt to define the results which have been achieved. There are results which should be remembered and made fruitful. I may here mention such documents, far too little known, as the *Call to Unity* of the Lausanne Conference, and the report of the second section of that conference: 'The Church's Message to the World: the Gospel', which expresses the common faith of all Christians as do few other forms of words, a kind of modern creed that could be subscribed to to-day by Christians of all Churches. Nor should we forget the *Affirmation of Unity* of Edinburgh which the delegates to this conference would do well to study, and which they might perhaps wish to reaffirm.

The Edinburgh Conference took the decisive step in order to enter into co-operation with the other great ecumenical enterprise, the Life and Work movement which has carried on the work of the Stockholm Conference of 1925, and which owns Archbishop Söderblom as its prophet and first leader. It appointed members in the committee of fourteen which in Utrecht in 1938 became the 'Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches'. The World Council was definitely established through its first assembly in Amsterdam in 1948. The Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Conference became the World Council's Commission on Faith and Order. It preserved its individuality, but the incorporation into the larger body gave it a new responsibility and placed it in a wider setting that should not hamper its freedom but might fertilise its activities. How the final integration into the World Council should take shape, and on what lines the Faith and Order movement may best be carried on, will be one of the most important questions that this conference has to consider. This matter was discussed at the meeting of the Commission in Clarens in August last year, but we were not then able to come to a conclusion. The Executive Committee, at its meeting in London at the beginning of this year, arrived at a more definite proposal which will be laid before this conference. That the integration into the World Council should be fully realised

¹ To be Published by S.P.C.K. 1954.

is, I believe, our common wish and an obvious necessity. It has been made clear by the declarations presented by the youth groups at our later Commission meetings that there exists in the younger generation a certain impatience with the present state of things and an ardent wish that the ecumenical movement should present a united front, and that no isolationism should be tolerated. On the other hand Faith and Order stands for a tradition that should not be sacrificed, and I have the impression that this fact is very much appreciated in the Central Committee of the World Council. There have been no attempts to coerce Faith and Order into a uniformity that is not acceptable to its own representatives and I wish here to express to the Central Committee and to the General Secretary, whom it is a privilege to have here in our midst, my appreciation of the generous spirit in which the question of integration has been handled. It is clear, however, that that form of organisation on which we might here agree must be approved by the next meeting of the Central Committee before the necessary changes in the constitution of the Council are definitely carried through. It should perhaps be made quite clear that with the beginning of this conference the Commission, which is a transformation of the Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Conference, ceases to exist. This committee, or commission, has been a large, in the opinion of many, too large a body, of some 170 members of whom only some have been present at any of our meetings. On behalf of the Commission I have now to hand over to the conference the task with which we have been entrusted. The conference will have to decide what new organ or organs it may wish to appoint. It will also have to settle whether the work of Faith and Order should be continued on the same lines, or whether some other policy ought to be adopted. So far Faith and Order has taken great care not to try in any way to negotiate unity, or to tell some Churches what they ought to do. This has been a ruling principle of the greatest value. It has been an indispensable condition for that spirit of quiet discussion, of a mutual endeavour to understand, which has given to our meetings their peculiar character. I do not think that we should deviate from this principle. But unavoidably, the Faith and Order organs have taken a vivid interest in whatever goes on in the field of unity, and have tried to make such advances known in other parts of the world. This is an important work, which I

think should be carried on, and may become increasingly important. I should, however, remind you that the 'post-Lund consultation' between representatives from Churches where actual schemes of unity have been carried out, or are being discussed, although organised by our general secretary, Mr. Oliver Tomkins, is not an enterprise of the Faith and Order movement, although its Executive Committee has taken cognisance of, and has encouraged the scheme.

Our chief task, however, is not to consider organisation and policy, it is to carry on the discussion of fundamental questions relating to Faith and Order. Looking back, I seem to discern several stages in the history of our movement. The first stage, represented by the preliminary meeting in Geneva, and to a large extent by the Lausanne Conference, was characterised by a certain minimising of the differences. The reunited Church was spoken of as a tangible reality, as something that might perhaps not be realised in the present generation, but still was an event to be reckoned with as possible in a not too distant future. A certain tendency to gloss over differences by formulas that could be interpreted differently was perhaps not absent during this stage. During the second stage the real depth of our differences became gradually more and more apparent. That was the result of the answers which came in from the Churches, and the very thorough work done by special commissions, such as the commission on the doctrine of grace under the energetic chairmanship of Bishop A. C. Headlam. At Edinburgh the note of unity still seemed to dominate, particularly in the remarkable report on 'The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ'. Gradually, the tenacity of the confessional traditions, the different background and temper of the different Churches, became realised. It is remarkable that the ecumenical movement has had as a parallel, perhaps partly as a result, a great revival of confessional consciousness. The world organisations of Churches belonging to the same tradition have showed a remarkable activity. That is true of Methodism. It is also true of Lutheranism, which has a few weeks ago manifested its will to unity in the great Hannover assembly. The whole development of theology has brought with it on the one hand a discarding of earlier controversies—such as that between an eschatological and an immanentist theology—and on the other a reaffirmation of doctrinal positions which had seemed to have lost their actuality.

In many Churches theology has gained a new importance—and at the same time the Church itself has become the focus of interest.

It may be gathered from the very important material which is laid before this conference that the problems of Faith and Order have become more difficult, but at the same time more urgent than ever before. At the same time as the differences, the disagreements have become sharper, the consciousness of the different confessions and denominations more vivid than at any earlier time, the will to unity has been strengthened, not least through the formation of the World Council. In spite of all that separates us, we who have gathered here to the Third Conference on Faith and Order may well make our own the words in the Amsterdam message: 'We intend to stay together'.

The three reports and the three volumes of essays are in the hands of us all. The Commission on the Church was appointed as far back as 1938. It has had through all these years as its chairman Dr. Newton Flew. It has been for him truly a labour of love. We owe him a debt of gratitude for the persistency with which he has carried out his plan, and we include in this also a grateful recognition of the work of the secretary of his commission, Bishop Riches. This volume contains also a reprint of the very valuable report of the American Theological Committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Clarence T. Craig, whose absence for reasons of health is a great disappointment.

The Commission on Ways of Worship was appointed by the Continuation Committee in 1939, in the conviction that the individuality of a Church is expressed in its worship not less than its confessional documents. The Commission had the good fortune to be able to work under the inspired leadership of Dr. Gerardus van der Leeuw of the Dutch Reformed Church. It was not given to him to see the completion of the work, nor can we here thank him for the service he has rendered. We have through his death suffered an incalculable loss. We mourn in him a great Christian and a scholar of rare eminence. We wish to thank the secretary of the commission, Mr. Wiebe Vos, and also the editors of the volume of essays. The Commission on Intercommunion also got its terms of reference in 1939. It has completed its task under the able chairmanship of Professor Donald Baillie, and has had as its secretary Professor John Marsh, to both of whom our thanks are due, also for the editing of the volume. These two reports

deal with questions of the highest importance and formulate problems of burning activity in the ecumenical world. In a way, they are subsidiary to the main theme, the nature of the Church, and should be discussed with this central problem present in the minds of the sections which may be appointed for their further study. Nor should we forget that this theme is of central importance to the whole World Council, that the report of the first section of the Assembly on 'The Universal Church in God's Design', and the discussion it roused, is an important part of the material before us—it was not possible for Faith and Order through a theological commission of its own to take part in the preparation for the Assembly, but we shall now have to consider how our conference can make such contribution as may reasonably be expected from it, to the Second Assembly, that is expected to meet at Evanston in 1954.

An important letter from Professor C. H. Dodd of Cambridge was read at the meeting of the Commission in Chichester in 1949. It is also printed in the autumn number for that year of *The Ecumenical Review*. It dealt with 'unavowed motives in ecumenical discussions', and contained a penetrating analysis of the factors of a non-theological character that have proved real obstacles to church unity. It gave a new emphasis to a subject which was already before the Edinburgh Conference, the subject of non-theological factors in church unity. It seemed obvious that this aspect of the problem could not be neglected. It was decided by the Executive Committee at Bièvres in 1951 that this should be a fourth theme for the Lund Conference, but that it should not be entrusted to a particular commission or section of the conference, but be presented in such a way as to form a common background to the other subjects. It has been discussed by a group at Bossey. The result is presented in a brochure, *Social and Cultural Factors in Church Divisions*, which has been sent to the delegates.

Speaking of the preparations, I cannot but pay a tribute to our secretaries, our indefatigable general secretary, Mr. Oliver Tomkins, who has brought into the movement a new eagerness, and who has also travelled extensively in the cause of Faith and Order; our theological secretary, Dr. Leonard Hodgson, who represents the continuity in the movement, and who has had a large share in the preparation of our material; and our American secretary, Dr. Floyd Tomkins, who is a living link with the early

period and who has done important work in keeping the interest alive in America and in co-ordinating the work on both sides of the Atlantic.

The invitation to this conference has gone out to the member Churches of the World Council, and to those Churches that have sent delegates to earlier Faith and Order conferences. It is, I think, important that Churches which for some reason have not seen their way to accept membership in the World Council, should not thereby be debarred from participation in the discussions on Faith and Order.

Since the World Council in the future will invite the Churches to send delegates to a full assembly as a rule every five years, it has seemed clear that it would not be practicable to gather Faith and Order conferences on the same scale as those in Lausanne and Edinburgh. Thus the number of delegates to this conference has had to be kept within narrower limits, which has raised difficult problems with regard to the allocation of places. It is the hope of the Executive Committee that these problems have on the whole been solved in a satisfactory way. It remains for me to welcome all the delegations which have found their way to this city. There are lamentable blanks in our list of membership. We know that there are many who would have desired to be with us to-day, but who have not been able to come. We welcome all those who, as duly appointed delegates of their Churches, have gathered to our conference, delegations from all continents, representing the most diverse confessional and ecclesiastical types. This conference differs from its two predecessors in part because the world of 1952 is so different from that of 1937 and even more of 1927. There are areas of the world which are not represented amongst us to-day which have been in the past. The young Churches in China are quite without representation, though we do rejoice at the presence not only of delegates from Japan but of one who has come especially to represent the suffering Christians of Korea.

Never have we had a conference with so few Orthodox representatives. The Patriarchate of Moscow was, of course, invited, as were the Evangelical Churches in Russia, but although the correspondence and requests for literature showed a lively interest, no delegates have been appointed. No delegations have been appointed by the Orthodox Churches in Bulgaria, Roumania or Poland. In these circumstances it was all the more

sad that the Church of Greece, which had appointed a strong delegation, has in the end had no representatives at the conference. The Archbishop of Athens writes:

‘The Holy Synod of the Church of Greece appointed as delegates to the Lund Conference the Metropolitans of Phthiotis—Ambrosius, Salonica—Panteleimon, Kalavryta—Agathonikos and Professors H. Alivisatos, B. Joannides and J. Karmiris. Within the last few days I have been informed by all three bishops that because of urgent business in their respective dioceses, they are unable to leave Greece and I have also heard from Professor Karmiris that he now finds that he will not be able to attend the Conference. Because of this the remaining delegates, Professor Alivisatos and Joannides, feel that they cannot accept the full responsibility of representing the Church of Greece at the Lund Conference.

‘Unfortunately, it is impossible to find substitute delegates at this late date, especially as there are very few of the Bishops and Professors who speak English.

‘I wish to assure you that the absence of a delegation from the Church of Greece to the Lund Conference means in no way a change in the policies of our Church or its participation as a member of the World Council of Churches and of the several committees to which members from Greece have been appointed; neither does it mean that our co-operation has lessened. We have had a long and effective mutual contact with the co-operating Churches in the World Council and through this contact we have become closer in knowledge of the co-operating Churches and the Greek Church has become known and esteemed among the several church members.’

It is similarly unfortunate that present circumstances in Egypt caused the delegate of the Patriarchate of Alexandria also to withdraw at a late stage.

Under these conditions, we welcome the more warmly the few Orthodox delegates under the jurisdiction of the Oecumenical Patriarchate and those from other separated Eastern Churches.

In Edinburgh there was one very notable gap. The German Evangelical Churches were not represented then. We greet with great satisfaction the German delegation to this conference. We expect from it notable contributions.

We welcome warmly the delegations from Czechoslovakia and Hungary and pray that, in these days together, meeting upon the deep matters of our common faith, much may be said and done to deepen love and mutual understanding and nothing to increase the world's all-too-large stores of suspicion and misrepresentation.

Following so soon after the I.M.C. Conference at Willingen and the Lutheran World Federation at Hannover and partly because of them, we rejoice that we too can bear some witness to the common Christian life of Asia and Africa with the countries of Europe, America and the Antipodes. There are over thirty representatives of church life in what used to be called 'the Younger Churches'. We know from experience how sharply and healthily they challenge us of the older Churches in our leisurely attitude towards the problem of reunion and we look forward hopefully to the contribution which they will again make here.

We deeply regret the absence for reasons of health of individuals who had hoped to be with us—Dean C. T. Craig who has had a serious operation, Archbishop Gregg of Armagh, Archbishop Grünberg of Latvia.

The specially invited consultants form an important group whose presence here is of particular value.

That the Church of Rome has not found it possible to take active part in any of the gatherings which we have been used to call ecumenical in spite of the absence of so large a part of the Christian world, is a tragic fact which we have had to accept. That for the first time Roman Catholic observers have been appointed, by due authority, is an important sign that the great Church of Rome is not indifferent to what is being done in order to further a better understanding between Christians of different traditions, and that an amity of souls can exist in spite of ecclesiastical barriers that appear insurmountable. I have great pleasure in welcoming the observers who have been appointed by the Vicar Apostolic of Stockholm.

It has been the privilege at most of our meetings to have with us a youth group. The group we have now present, although not consisting of formal members, is a most important part of our Conference. We shall need their encouragement and their criticism. We hope they will feel at home in our midst.

A special welcome should also be extended to the visitors who

will be present at our common meetings and share in our life.

The representatives of the Press have a most important function which the officers of the conference will do their best to assist.

It is to me, a former professor of this University, a very welcome duty to have to express to the Rector of Lund University our heartfelt thanks for the generosity with which the localities of the University have been put at our disposal. I also wish to thank the city of Lund and the Cathedral parish for all that has already been done in order to make us feel at home in this city.

One task still remains. On behalf of the Church of Sweden, I wish to say how highly we appreciate the privilege of receiving a conference on Faith and Order. It is the second time an event of great ecumenical importance has taken place in our country. For those who took part in the first conference on Life and Work in Stockholm in 1925 that remains an experience that we are not likely to forget. Here the scene is different. We shall not here be surrounded by the impressive pageantry that then symbolised the beginning of the ecumenical era. The unpretentious forms under which we meet will perhaps be felt to be in harmony with the task which lies before us and the nature of our deliberations. The Church of Sweden is conscious of its heritage, from the times of the undivided Western Church as well as from the Reformation. It feels vividly its kinship with the Lutheran Churches of the world, but it reckons as a part of its heritage also the openness to the movement for Christian unity in which it has the privilege to co-operate. It opens to you its heart, and welcomes you all to its sanctuaries.

We may differ in our discussions. But I trust that we shall feel united in our adoration.

May the blessing of God Almighty be upon us. May the love of Jesus Christ kindle in our hearts a true charity. May His Holy Spirit inspire our thoughts, and lead us in the way of truth.

The address of the President was received with appreciation. He then said that they would proceed with the nomination of the three secretaries of the Conference, and on behalf of the Executive Committee he put forward the names of the Rev. Oliver Tomkins as Conference Secretary; of Dr. Leonard Hodgson as Theological Secretary; and of Dr. Floyd Tomkins as Associate Secretary. These nominations were unanimously accepted.

The President then drew the attention of the meeting to the rules of procedure contained in the constitution in the *Handbook*, and proposed that these should be accepted. This was unanimously agreed. The next business was to proceed to the election of committees on *Press* and *Worship* (as listed on p. 351 in Appendix 4).

The Secretary announced that some messages of greeting had already been received and that others would no doubt arrive during the course of the meeting. There was a telegram from Bishop German of the Serbian Orthodox Church, expressing regret that the delegation which had been appointed from Yugoslavia had not, unhappily, been able to arrive in time, but sending greetings and best wishes. Greetings had also been received from the Australian Council for the World Council of Churches, the Christchurch Theological Society of New Zealand, from the Studentengemeinde in conference in Eastern Germany, and also from Dr. Herman Sasse, from Bishop Cranswick and from the Abbé Couturier. Suitable replies were sent in the name of the Conference.

The Vice-President, Dr. Douglas Horton, said that he had the honour of proposing that a message should be sent from the Conference to His Majesty the King of Sweden, in grateful remembrance of his interest in the Conference and in the cause of Christian unity. This was unanimously agreed. Later, the following reply was received:

‘Will you please convey to the conference my sincere thanks for their kind message. I express my very best wishes for the success of our conference the aims of which have my keen support and understanding. Gustaf Adolf.’

The German text of the following telegram was received on August 24th from the 75th German Catholic Congress meeting in Berlin:

‘The Berlin Catholic Congress greets the Christians assembled in Lund. May the Third World Conference on Faith and Order bring nearer to Christendom the end which was so near to the heart of the Lord, that all who believe in Him should be brought to perfect unity. In this sense we are united in prayer. 75th German Catholic Congress.’

The Conference authorised a reply which was despatched the next day in the following terms:²

² The German texts were as follows:

‘Der Berliner Katholikentag grüsst die in Lund versammelten Christen. Möge die Dritte Weltkonferenz für Glaube und Kirchenverfassung die Christenheit jenem Ziel näher bringen das dem Herrn so sehr am Herzen lag, dass alle die an

'The Third World Conference on Faith and Order expresses sincere thanks for your greeting. We are united in prayer for the unity of the Church of Jesus Christ in accordance with His will. Brilioth, President. Tomkins, Secretary.'

The President then called upon Dr. Hodgson to address the meeting and introduce the reports of the Theological Commissions.

THE TASK OF THE THIRD WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER

DR. LEONARD HODGSON

I

First, what are we here for? We are the third in a series of conferences: Lausanne 1927, Edinburgh 1937, Lund 1952. We are a gathering of representatives sent by their Churches to confer together on the questions of faith and order which keep us divided into separate communions. We are sent by our Churches in the hope that by conferring together during these two weeks, by deepening our understanding of what others really believe, we may discover that some of the differences which have kept us apart need do so no longer.

(a) *Representatives of the Churches.* The last time such a gathering was held was at Edinburgh in 1937. That conference appointed a continuation committee which in 1948 became the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches. I have been its theological secretary and am to introduce to you the reports of its Theological Commissions. Let me make it quite clear, once and for all, that our part has simply been to prepare the way for you, the officially appointed delegates of the Churches, intelligently and efficiently to discuss the issues left over from Edinburgh. You are not called together to endorse what we, as supposedly expert theologians, have agreed that you ought to say. We have examined the Edinburgh Report with a view to

Ihn glauben, zu vollkommener Einheit verbunden seien, in diesem Sinne im Gebet vereint. Der 75. Deutsche Katholikentag.'

'Dritte Weltkonferenz für Glauben und Kirchenverfassung dankt herzlich für Ihr Grusswort. Gemäss dem Willen Christi vereinigen wir uns mit Ihnen im Gebet für die Einheit der Kirche Christi. Brilioth Präsident. Tomkins Sekretär.'

determining what issues next need the attention of the Churches. We have appointed theological commissions and instructed them to aim at laying these issues before you in such a way that you can at once grasp the salient points and engage in profitable discussion. Now it is for you, as representing the Churches, to take these reports as material to get to work on together, and to see how far you can come to a common mind in discussing them. Get out of your heads at once any idea that we are asking you to produce the report of this Lund Conference by revising or amending these reports of the theological commissions. It is for you to decide what method you wish to follow. You are free to write your own report *de novo*, recording the agreements and disagreements that you have arrived at through discussing this material together.

(b) *Conference*. Conferring means discussing, and I can best make clear what I want to say by drawing a distinction between discussing and arguing. In arguing each party thinks he knows what he stands for; he is trying to put forward arguments which will not only enable the other to understand it but persuade him to change his mind and come round to holding it. In discussing the different parties are aware of being faced by something which is a problem to them all, they are not trying to convert one another, each to his own view, so much as to help one another to a fuller understanding of the mystery, an understanding which shall explain how the reality has looked so different to men coming to it by different approaches. It may be that this fuller understanding will lead to the reconciliation of different views as partial apprehensions of the same truth seen from different approaches. It may be that it will lead to some changes of mind, to the abandoning of some positions, to some conversions. It may be that some delegations have come to this conference briefed by their Churches to stand up for certain positions, and that they will go back to their Churches convinced that these briefs need revision. That is as the Holy Spirit may lead you. I cannot prophesy. But I beg of you to give the Holy Spirit the opportunity to lead you by entering upon your work here as men seeking through discussion for light on common problems, and not as men commissioned to defend either Catholic truth, Reformation principles, Orthodox tradition, the conservative sobriety of the Anglican *via media*, or the pioneering enthusiasm of American independency.

II

When I became secretary to the Faith and Order movement in 1933 the Continuation Committee appointed by the Lausanne Conference of 1927 thought that that conference had shown 'The Church in the Purpose of God' to be the most important subject needing further discussion. But when we met at Hertenstein, Switzerland, in 1934, it was found impossible to make a direct attack upon that subject. Various other topics were brought forward as concerns of different Churches demanding immediate attention. The programme for Edinburgh 1937 was built up of these concerns, discussing such subjects as Grace, the Word of God, the Communion of Saints, the Ministry and Sacraments, and different understandings of unity. The experience of Lausanne was repeated. Over and over again it became clear that differences on this or that particular topic were rooted in different conceptions of the Church.³ When the Edinburgh Continuation Committee met a year later, in 1938, it was unanimous that the direct attack could no longer be delayed, and Dr. Flew was asked to become chairman of the first of the three Theological Commissions whose reports you have before you, the Commission on The Church.

The following year, 1939, saw the setting up of the other two theological commissions, on Ways of Worship and Intercommunion. It is important to see how, in different ways, these form part of a combined operation advancing upon the central subject of the Church.

(a) *Ways of Worship*. These conferences are held for the purpose of enabling Churches to grow in mutual understanding of one another's convictions on matters of faith and order. For this we have to try to do that most difficult thing, to see with the eyes of men who are at home in a tradition different from our own. Our study of Ways of Worship was embarked upon as a means to this end. This is clear from the passage in the Edinburgh Report which gave rise to it. 'The Churches have hardly begun to explore the possibilities of realising a more vital understanding and a deeper unity through acquaintance with each other's modes and experiences of worship.'⁴ But besides helping us to

³ See Edinburgh Report (F. & O. Pamphlet No. 90), Ch. VI (IV), 1.

⁴ Ch. VI (V), 9.

feel and see things as others do who look at them from inside their own customs and traditions, this study has a further value. Differences in ways of worship need not be adequate grounds for church division unless they be indicative of incompatible conceptions of the Church. We are not in this conference concerned with the question whether the so-called 'Liturgical Movement' represents a true line of advance in Christian ways of worship. That is a question for Churches to settle for themselves, or, if they will, to discuss in the World Council Assembly or at some other gathering called for the purpose. Our twofold task is different: (i) by growing understanding of one another's ways of worship to grow in understanding one another's points of view; (ii) to discover how far different ways of worship involve doctrinal differences which are incompatible in a single united Church.

(b) *Intercommunion*. For a long time Faith and Order conferences shrank from and avoided directly facing this subject. It was packed so full of emotional dynamite that we were afraid lest poking into it should strike a spark that would blow our whole movement to pieces. All honour to the late Dr. Hagan of Edinburgh whose sturdy courage refused to let us rest in peace behind our cowardly evasions, and in 1939 led us to set up a theological commission to study it. That study required two stages: (i) to discover and set out the rules and customs which actually govern the practice of the different Churches to-day, and (ii) to obtain statements of the theological grounds underlying the different practices. The collection of these statements obtained by Professors Baillie and Marsh provides for the first time, so far as I know, a synoptic survey in which these theological grounds are brought out into the open, and the impression they make on me is that here, once again, the differences which divide us in practice are rooted in different conceptions of the Church.

You see, then, how the programme for this conference has come to take the shape it has. Underlying all particular questions is that of the nature of the Church. Therefore to begin with we all concentrate on this central issue. At this stage our division into sections is not so much for the purpose of examining different subjects, but to secure units of the right size for effective discussion. Certain sections, however, will be mainly composed of delegates who have expressed a wish to give special attention to Ways of Worship or Intercommunion, and doubtless these sections will

have those concerns in mind in their discussion of the Church. Then, after a pooling of the results of these discussions next Wednesday afternoon, those sections will directly consider their special subjects in the light of what has been thought and said about the nature of the Church, while the others try to make further progress in the discussion of that central issue.

III

I now come to the Report of the Commission on the Church. There is no need for me to spend time in trying to say what we owe to Dr. Flew, Bishop Riches, Dr. Richards, Dr. Craig, and all their associates. To do it adequately would take all the time we have, and more, so I had better not begin. And the same goes for the officers and members of the other Theological Commissions—Professor van der Leeuw, Mr. Vos, Mr. Hayman, Pastor Edwall, Dr. Maxwell, Dr. Hugh Thomson Kerr, Dr. Lowry, Professors Baillie and Marsh. But I must pause to express our great sense of loss at the passing of Professor van der Leeuw, and to join an expression of sympathy and assurance of prayers for his complete recovery to our regret at the absence of Dr. Craig.

Nor am I going to spend time going through the Reports and telling you what is in them. You have all had them and read them. I am not going to insult you by wasting your time in telling you what you know already. I am going to take them as read and try to answer the question 'Where do we go from here?'

In all our discussions here at Lund let us keep steadily in view the purpose of the conference. In discussing the Church, our one aim is to enquire: How far are the various conceptions of the Church which we bring with us reconcilable, so as to be tenable together in one united Church? This clearly involves a two-phase programme of work. First there is the laying side by side and explaining the positions from which we start as representatives of our Churches. Then there is the attempt to see (i) how far these can be related to one another as convergent approaches to the truth which is common to all, and (ii) by what revision or correction each may benefit through its intercourse with the others.

The first phase need not delay me long. It has been the work of our theological commissions to expose and compare the

various views that we have to consider here. Moreover, you bring them with you, each delegation representing its own Church. But I would illustrate from one instance what I mean by explaining ourselves to one another.

In connection with sacraments the phrase *ex opere operato* has been a centre of controversy. It has been borne in upon me that some at least of the battle has been with confused noise, owing to different understandings of the phrase. The Catholic accepts it because he is thinking of the *operans* as God. Sacramental worship is to him a bulwark against Pelagianism; it is the kind of worship in which the importance of the human element is at its minimum; what gives their meaning to the services of Baptism and Holy Communion is the belief that it is Christ who in Baptism incorporates the new member into that fellowship of forgiven sinners which is His mystical body on earth, it is Christ who in the Eucharist takes the bread and wine to be His means for continuing the ministry on earth begun at Bethlehem. The important thing about the service I have been attending is not what I was believing, thinking, or feeling like, but what God has done: *ex opere operato*. But to the protestant the phrase suggests the belief that certain spiritual benefits are to be acquired through the correct performance of ritual acts by earthly ministers. The thought is of the earthly minister as the *operans*, and the phrase *ex opere operato* connotes both the paganism of magic and the heresy of Pelagianism.

If I am right about this, there is much work of this kind to be done in clearing away misunderstandings.

Then comes the second phase, statement and explanation followed not by argument but by discussion. I have spoken of discussion as the work of men who, starting from what they bring with them in their different approaches, seek to help one another towards a deeper understanding of a mystery which is common to them all. The report of our theological commission indicates that in thinking about the Church we are confronted by two such mysteries. I want to suggest that we shall best relate our various conceptions of the Church to one another by trying together to see them in relation to these two mysteries.

(i) There is the mysterious problem that God creates us to be free persons, the mystery involved in the familiar words of St. Paul: 'I . . . yet not I, but Christ . . . in me'. At the heart of

the Christian life there is the paradox that somehow or other a man is most free, is most truly himself, when most fully surrendered to God. Attempts to dispose of the paradox by one-sided emphasis produced the Pelagian controversy. The same paradox underlay controversies concerning the doctrine of Grace, and our Edinburgh Conference showed its wisdom by refusing to try to explain it away. It is not surprising that this paradox, so well known to us in the life of each individual Christian, is equally germane to the corporate life of the Church.

This is most clearly illustrated in the statement published in March 1948 by the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, printed in our volume on *The Nature of the Church*. Let me quote two passages. In comparing the 'New Israel' with the Israel of the Old Testament it is said: 'Membership is not constituted by racial origins but by a personal allegiance. . . . The Messianic community was reborn by the events of the Gospel and is "a new creation".' And of present-day Baptist churches: 'Such churches are gathered by the will of Christ and live by the indwelling of his Spirit. . . . Local churches are formed by the response of believing men to the Lord's command.'⁵

On the one side 'a new creation, gathered by the will of Christ'. On the other, 'the response of believing men, membership constituted by personal allegiance'. See how the whole paradox is involved.

As I read the papers contributed to this volume, and the report of the commission, I cannot help wondering to what extent in our divided Christendom our divisions represent differing emphasis on one side or other of this paradox.

There is one preliminary question which we must first get out of the way, the question whether we believe it to be God's will that the Church should be an earthly body with a continuing history in space and time. If any man thinks that the only continuity and unity required is that of the risen, ascended Lord, Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day and for ever, that He embodies Himself as and when He will in this or that group of men and women as corporately they make the response of faith, so that the same group can at different times be and not be the Church according to the presence or absence of faith—if any man thinks this, I do not see how there can be any reconciliation of

⁵ Pp. 161, 162.

that belief with the conviction that there must be some kind of historical unity and continuity of the earthly body. You will have to face this question. In what follows I shall be speaking only of those who agree that there must be some such historical unity and continuity, but differ as to its nature.

I return to take up my main thread, the consideration of our differing conceptions of the Church as part of a common effort to deepen our understanding of the paradox 'I, yet not I, but Christ'. I have spoken of how, in the mind of the Catholic, sacraments bear witness to the divine initiative. They speak to him of the truth that in religion what matters most is what God does. What we call our religion is our response to the prior activity of God. Now it seems to me that in the mind of the Catholic this truth is witnessed to not only by sacraments in particular, but by the existence of the Church as a whole. For him it is primarily Christ continuing His redemptive ministry on earth through those whom He calls and cleanses from their sins to be His agents. These form a congregation of faithful men among whom the word is preached and the sacraments administered, but that is the secondary truth about it, the result of the prior activity of Christ, which is the primary truth. The reason why the faith of the creeds and the ministry in the apostolic succession of bishops is regarded by Orthodox and Catholics as essential to the Church is because they believe these to be the given structure through which the risen Lord wills to carry on His work. The Church is not constituted by the response of faith made by its members: the Church is constituted by Christ, who is revealed in word and sacrament through creed and ministry: it is the divinely given framework enduring through the ages within which successive generations of believers can make the response of faith.

This emphasis on the divine activity is in danger of two kinds of corruption. (a) If it is pressed to the exclusion of any recognition of the importance of the human side, the result is the substitution of cult practice for morality. (b) If the human side is thought of as concerned with the correct performance of the cult, the result is the false magical sense of *ex opere operato* sacraments.

Protestants, no less than Orthodox and Catholics, believe in the divine initiative, the 'I, yet not I, but Christ'. But because the

Reformation came to reform the Church at a time when it was suffering from both these forms of corruption, it came to emphasise the importance of the response of faith, to remind us that without this on the human side the Church cannot be its true self. 'Some Congregationalists, though not the majority, regard baptism as admitting to church membership, but all are agreed that its privileges and responsibilities cannot be fully entered upon without a personal profession of faith.' 'A Congregational church is in principle a covenant relationship, binding the members to God and to one another through Christ, the Head of the Church.' 'The true continuity with the Church of past ages which we cherish is to be found in the continuity of the Christian experience, the fellowship in the gift of the one Spirit; in the continuity of the allegiance to one Lord, the continued proclamation of the message, the continued acceptance of the mission.'⁶ Notice the stress laid on 'personal profession of faith', 'covenant relationship binding the members', 'experience, fellowship, allegiance'.

Don't misunderstand me. I am not suggesting an antithesis in which Orthodox and Catholics stand for God's initiative and protestants for man's response. What I am trying to say is this. Faced by one of the deepest mysteries of our existence, the paradox at the heart of the Christian life, the Church in the first two thousand years of its life has been experimenting with different ways of holding together the two sides of its dialectic with the right emphasis on each. In the course of these experiments we have become divided into separate communions with different emphases and different methods of expressing them. Is God now calling us (i) to see other people's methods and emphases as other ways of trying to do the same things that we are doing, and (ii) to try to see whether these differing emphases and methods, when rightly understood, may not all rightly have a place in one united Church?

Let me give one illustration of the kind of question I have in mind. At first sight Catholic sacramentalism and Quaker religion seem at opposite ends of the Christian world. Yet I have sometimes wondered whether there might not be a place for both in a united Church. Sacraments are means to an end. The end is communion with God, for which in the world to come no such means will be needed. They are means appropriate to life in this

⁶ *Nature of the Church*, pp. 181, 183, 207.

world, ordained by God to be used for that purpose. And even in His dealing with us in this world *Deus non alligatur sacramentis*: the most catholic of us must train our flocks in such a way that when a regular communicant is called to work in regions far from any Christian altar he need not think that he is being taken away from communion with God. May it not be that God wills to have, within His sacramental Church, men and women with special vocation to a religious order whose function is to bear witness, even here and now in this world, to the truth that *Deus non alligatur sacramentis*? Is it possible that in this period of our division He has been calling and training the Society of Friends to prepare them to fulfil that function in His united Church?

That is the kind of question to which I hope this conference will be giving its attention in the coming days.

(ii) My second fundamental mystery is the nature of unity. It was in studying the doctrine of the Trinity that I came to realise that unity is not a simple thing, that the most intense unity which exists is the unity of God who in this world of space and time makes Himself known to us in His threefoldness as Father, Son, and Spirit, whose unity is a wonder, the mystery of which we shall only begin to fathom in that world where we shall begin to know even as we are known. Now I am wondering whether in discussing the desired unity of the Church we do not too easily take it for granted that we know quite well what unity means, that when we oppose our different ideas of what the Church's unity should be, it is certain that it must be one or other of them. What if the unity God wills for His Church be a unity which, like His own unity, we have not yet conceived in our minds? What if it be a unity which the Church has to become in fact in order that its members may begin to understand it in thought?

I have heard that a few years ago, at a meeting in Canada of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, there was some controversy between those who held that we need nothing more than a federation of Churches and those who could be content with nothing less than what is called organic unity.

The phrase 'organic unity' needs careful definition if it is not to be misleading. It is important to be quite clear that for those who espouse it the noun which corresponds to the adjective 'organic' is not organisation but organism. The unity they have in mind is not that of an artifact but of a living being, a being

in which the different elements which compose it are bound harmoniously into unity by the unifying power of the current of life which animates it. The unity of the Church must be organic as being the unity of the body of Christ. It must be composed of elements belonging to this world of space and time, of men and women, laws, customs and institutions; otherwise it would not be a body. But these elements must be unified as the body of the Lord by the unifying power of His indwelling Spirit; otherwise it would not be organic.

At first sight this conception seems utterly opposed to the notion of a federation of distinct Churches. But on further reflection I begin to wonder whether this is necessarily so. If it is important to remember that organic is the adjective of organism, it is equally important to observe, as Dr. Dillistone has reminded us,⁷ that the root of our word federation is the Latin *fœdus*—covenant! Is it absolutely certain that a covenant relationship between distinct Churches, if in it there were realised to the full all the deep implications of the word covenant, might not bind them together into the organic unity of the body of Christ?

None of the Churches represented in this conference holds that for purposes of jurisdiction the Church should be organised like the Church of Rome, a pyramidal system in which all members are subject to an earthly head at its apex. Among those here we Anglicans and the Orthodox are probably the ones most likely to espouse the ideal of organic unity. What does this organic unity mean for us? In the Anglican communion we have no pope; we have no synod, assembly or council exercising jurisdiction over us all. We are a family of independent Churches, each with its own governing body legislating for and controlling its own members. The Lambeth Conference, our only organ of concerted action, is a purely consultative gathering of bishops who meet at the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury to take counsel with one another. It has no more authority than this conference. Its resolutions must be ratified by enactment in the governing body of each constituent Church if they are to become binding upon its members. For the Orthodox the unity of their family of autocephalous Churches is, I believe, of a similar kind.

Hitherto the distinctness of the Churches united in these communions has been due to geographical factors. In principle, the

⁷ In *The Structure of the Divine Society*.

theory has been that in any one area of the earth's surface there can be only one Church, and within each Church in any one area only one diocese with one bishop. The question I want to ask is whether it is essential to the maintenance of organic unity that the distinction between Churches should be of this geographical kind? There are already indications of the theory's breaking down. In the United States of America our Anglican Church has entered into relations with the Polish National Catholic Church that are inconsistent with it. In that same continent there are among the Orthodox parallel jurisdictions based not on the present geographical location of the faithful, but on that of the lands from which their forefathers have come. Orthodoxy in America is the organic unity of a number of autocephalous Churches distinguished by the fact that the forefathers of each came from different European lands. Is it possible that for the one united Church of God the requirements of organic unity could be met by a covenant relationship between independent Churches, geographically overlapping, whose independence is due to their descent from spiritual forefathers whose differing approaches to the common truth seemed at the time to necessitate breach of communion, who have left behind them a legacy of differing methods for giving expression to the 'I, yet not I' of Christian faith?

If some such organic unity through covenant relationship could be accepted as the goal to be aimed at, countless practical problems would lie before the Churches to be worked out in detail. Even now, in our present divided condition, within some particular Churches, the question of the unit of authority is one which causes trouble. How far this conference, in the time at its disposal, can deal with such points, I cannot say. If you can manage to deal with them, the more the better. But what I am now asking you to pay first attention to is the central question of the nature of the Church's unity, and to attend to this not as men arguing for the relative superiority of the ideas you now have, but as men seeking together for light on a wonderful mystery which God wills to reveal to those who earnestly seek Him.

IV

So far as possible I have put what I want to say in the form of questions. Doubtless you have come with many others in your minds that you want to discuss. Bring them out. Raise them in your sections. As I said at the beginning, this is your conference. We of the Faith and Order Commission have done what we could to make the arrangements for your coming together, and to prepare material for your consideration. Now we hand the whole business over to you, for you to take charge and make of it what you will.

I have made two main suggestions, (i) that we discuss our differing conceptions of the Church as men seeking together for further light on the central paradox of Christian living, the 'I, yet not I, but Christ', and (ii) that we discuss the question of church unity as men seeking together for further light on the mysterious question of the nature of unity itself. Let me now say why I have been led to make these suggestions.

A month or two ago I received a letter in which were written the following words:

'Some will come with rather high expectations, and there is a great risk that they will be disappointed. . . . If we cannot look forward to something which carries us definitely beyond Edinburgh, the chief aim for the conference will not be reached.'

That letter made me ask myself the question: In what way can we 'look forward to something which carries us definitely beyond Edinburgh' while keeping the terms of reference of a Faith and Order Conference? It is not for us to take practical steps towards church reunion, not even to form schemes and recommend them to the Churches for their action. The Faith and Order movement was founded to enable the Churches to grow by discussion in mutual understanding, and so to be in a better position to initiate action. The initiative must rest with them. What can we do except go on talking together as before?

I cast my mind back over the history of the movement. I saw how much growth there has been in this mutual understanding, how it has grown from small beginnings at the preliminary

gathering in Geneva in 1920, through Lausanne 1927 and Edinburgh 1937. I tried to look to the future, and asked myself: Can we go on for ever and ever, round and round in the same circle, explaining ourselves to one another? If the time should ever come when we can take that for granted, what would our next step be? And can we begin to move on to that next step now?

Then it came to me that it will be a real step forward if, on the basis of what we have gained in the way of mutual understanding, we join together in seeking light on mysteries which are common to us all, light which, reflected back on our present distresses, may show the Churches a way forward to unity. This is proper Faith and Order work, work which seeks to help the Churches by shedding light on their relations with one another. And it is a carrying forward of our own past work, for it is only as we bring with us our growth in mutual understanding from 1920 to 1952 that we can join together in this further enquiry. This conference meets at a moment of transition. It would be foolish to pretend that we have done all that can or need be done in the stage of mutual explanation of where we as Churches now stand. In these coming days you will find much of that still needing to be done. Do it as men for whom it is preparatory for a further advance on which you are already embarking.

One final word. At ecumenical gatherings it is often said, and rightly said, that church union will come to us as God's gift, that we shall best prepare ourselves for it not by devising man-made schemes of reunion, but by drawing nearer to Christ and so to one another in Him. So far, so good. But this must not be made an excuse for turning aside from the kind of work to which this conference is called, as though drawing nearer to Christ meant substituting some activity called prayer for the strenuous exercise of our minds in pursuit of truth. He to whom we are to draw near is the Lord who claims to be not only the way and the life, but also the truth. In every effort to grasp more fully the truth about the 'I, yet not I', and the nature of unity, we are seeking to draw near to Him, as He stands above this conference saying indeed, 'Ask, and it shall be given you' (for all our work must be set in the context of prayer), but saying also, 'Seek, and ye shall find: knock, and it shall be opened unto you'.

The Afternoon Session on Saturday, August 16th

ADDRESS BY ARCHBISHOP ATHENAGORAS

The President introduced Archbishop Athenagoras, who addressed the Conference on behalf of the Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople.

Most Reverend President,—Although I have the honour to be one of the Vice-Presidents of the Commission on Faith and Order, I present myself to the honourable members of this Conference preferably for these moments in the capacity of a Prelate of the Greek Orthodox Church who happens to be Exarch of the Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople.

The capacity of a Greek Orthodox Prelate is not at all in contrast to the capacity of any officer of this Commission. On the contrary, I believe that the two offices are in full harmony and helpful to each other in the sacred endeavour in search of the unity of Christendom, in which the World Council of Churches and the Greek Orthodox Church are engaged. This being the case I may as well speak on behalf of the two offices at the same time. But I am appointed as the leader of the Patriarchal delegation to this conference composed of Greek and Russian theologians and the plenipotentiary delegate of the Patriarchate of Antioch and of the autonomous and autocephalous Church of Cyprus.

In these various capacities I have the honour to address this conference and I hope that I will be allowed to use a little time of its very congested programme.

The Greek Orthodox Church comprises over two hundred million members; but the well known temporary political reasons prevent the Orthodox national Churches behind the iron curtain from participating as delegates to this Conference. So we may say that the delegation of the Oecumenical Patriarchate under my leadership has to represent the whole Greek Orthodox, or Eastern Orthodox Church, if you prefer this title.

By his appointment of me as the leader of the Patriarchal delegation to the conference, His All Holiness the Oecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras entrusted me also to convey to this Conference his greetings and his paternal blessings and the expression of his sincere admiration for the enthusiasm and efforts of the

Christian groups for the great and sacred ideal of the unity of Christendom in the one Holy Church of Christ. The unity of all Christendom is the ideal of the Greek Orthodox Church and in all her prayers she constantly prays 'for the peace of the whole world, for the stability of the Holy Church of God and for the union of all'.

The Oecumenical Patriarchate has full knowledge of the great obstacles and difficulties that the ecumenical movement confronts in pursuing the realisation of its ideal, especially in its Faith and Order department. The Patriarchate follows and studies all the relevant reports which are issued by the various committees. It appreciates the value of many conclusions which after deep and long research the reports bring out to light. It judges with affection and understanding the resolutions which they make, regardless of the fact that some of them are not correct according to the Orthodox understanding of the Faith. We attribute it to the brief space of time that has elapsed since the ecumenical movement started its colossal work.

It is for this reason and with the same attitude that the Patriarchate, in spite of the adverse circumstances which it confronts, has sent a delegation to this Conference as it did to the previous conferences in Edinburgh, Lausanne and Stockholm.

This year's delegation consists of well-educated Greek professors at the Halki Theological School, Chrysostom Constantinides, Maximos Repanellis, Emmanuel Photiades, Emilian Timiades and, well known for many good reasons, the Russian professors and authors George Florovsky and Leo Zander.

This decision of the Oecumenical Patriarchate to participate through this delegation in this Conference and its sincere desire to see realised the goal of the World Council of Churches, honours its Holy Synod and its entire Hierarchy. Nevertheless His All Holiness has as usual given instructions to the delegation not to be involved in dogmatical disputes.

This instruction is not at all an inimical act or a sign of indifferent attitude on the part of the Orthodox Church to the work of this Conference. On the contrary, she is more than ever its sincere friend. This fact is also seen from the letter of His Beatitude Spyridon, Archbishop of the Church of Greece to the Secretary of the Faith and Order Conference, the Rev. Oliver Tomkins:

'I wish to assure you that the absence of a delegation from the Church of Greece to the Lund Conference means in no way a change in the policies of our Church or its participation as a member of the World Council of Churches and of the several committees to which members from Greece have been appointed; neither does it mean that our co-operation has lessened. We have had a long and effective mutual contact with the co-operating Churches in the World Council and through this contact we have become closer in knowledge of the co-operating Churches and the Greek Church has become known and esteemed among the several church members.'

The reason for the above mentioned instruction is a natural product of the Orthodox Church's dogmatical and administrative policy during the nineteen centuries of its life, which is as follows: In the Greek Orthodox Church the individual theological opinions have no value whatsoever in themselves. It is the whole Church, clergy and laity, and above all her Hierarchy, the totality of her Bishops, not as individuals but in Holy Synods, that expresses the teaching of her faith.

This being the case, the Hierarchy of the entire Greek Orthodox Church reserves for itself only the right to decide what is wrong in religious matters and to pronounce what is compatible or incompatible with her faith.

That is why she allows her theologians, professors of theology in the Orthodox theological schools and above all her representatives at conferences to make only positive and definite statements about our faith without being involved in sterile disputes or voting for resolutions on matters of faith, worship and order which cannot be settled in this way.

That is not a new thing; it has always been so, because the Greek Orthodox Church knows and proclaims that she is not dealing with human teaching and human precepts but with divine ones and no one has the right to confuse these with individual opinions about them. She is the whole and only Church, the Body of Christ, the only mandatory agent of the Apostles. So she only can define the faith. And we are sure that this is a proof of her uniqueness.

So the delegates of the Greek Orthodox Church to the conference will be present in all its sections. They will follow the

discussions with an undiminished interest and will be ready to give information on questions relative to the teaching of our Church but not to express their opinions or even the opinion of our Church on the teaching of your Churches. We do not come to criticise other Churches but to help them, to illumine their mind in a brotherly manner by informing them about the teaching of the One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church which is the Greek Orthodox Church, unchanged since the apostolic era.

The only thing I take the liberty of recommending to all of you is to be kind enough to have the same friendly attitude towards us here and everywhere else, to respect our Church and, above all, to condemn in your conscience the tendency of any Protestant group to exercise proselytism in the bosom of the Greek Orthodox country, and to resist it. Such proselytising, if not stopped, might cause enmity amongst the Orthodox people against all the Protestants and this would be disastrous to any ecumenical movement.

Let us all be brothers in Christ and pray together and show to unbelievers everywhere that Christianity is the religion of love, the religion of every noble consideration of men to men, the heavenly religion of the Son of God our Lord Jesus Christ, so that they also will accept Him for their salvation and to the glory of God.

The President thanked His Grace for this statement, which had been heard with great interest and respect, and expressed the gratitude of the conference for the friendly spirit which pervaded it. He reminded the conference of the 1921 Encyclical of the Oecumenical Patriarchate, which was one of the important documents of the ecumenical movement. He asked Archbishop Athenagoras to convey to the Patriarchate the respectful thanks and greetings of the conference.

Subsequently, the following telegram was sent to the Oecumenical Patriarchate:

‘Sincere gratitude for kind greetings conveyed by Archbishop Athenagoras. Warmly reciprocated.

‘BRILIOTH, *Chairman.*

‘TOMKINS, *Secretary.*’

Dr. Hodgson then spoke on

FUTURE ORGANISATION OF FAITH AND ORDER

I should like to draw attention to the letter which was mailed to delegates some weeks ago concerning the problem of the organisation of Faith and Order after the conference, together

with a list of resolutions and recommendations from the Executive Committee, and a memorandum by myself. The conference must now consider two things: what is desirable, and what is possible, under present circumstances.

(I) *What is desirable.* The first principle of Faith and Order has been that in its conferences no steps shall be taken towards reunion, no schemes be formulated, no decision concerning disputed questions of Faith and Order be endorsed as the opinion of the conference. The reason for this principle is that the whole aim of the movement has been to draw all Churches into an ecumenical conversation. No Church must be made to feel that it must stay away or withdraw from a conference because otherwise it would have to endorse something disloyal to its own conviction, or be exhibited as a minority which was an obstacle to progress. Such agreements as are reached by conferences are therefore recorded, and the reports then submitted to the Churches as findings, and not as recommendations.

The second principle has been that world conferences are the governing body of the movement, because they consist of delegates appointed by the Churches. In between conferences theologians may meet and discuss problems of church unity, but these may be people who carry no weight with their Churches. As soon as a conference meets, therefore, the 'organisation' ceases to exist and the delegates take over. But a new situation has now arisen. The formation of the World Council of Churches means that every so many years there will be gatherings of church representatives, and this raises the question whether in future questions of Faith and Order should mainly be taken care of on the programme of the assemblies of the World Council of Churches, keeping open the possibility of calling a special Faith and Order Conference as circumstances make this desirable. This is the kind of question which must be considered during the coming fortnight.

The delegates must also consider what is desirable in regard to the relation of Faith and Order to the rest of the World Council. The relationship between Faith and Order and the Study Department needs clarifying. The World Council has set up a Committee on Structure and Functioning, and the work of Faith and Order must be so defined as to dovetail into the whole work of the Council.

(2) *What is possible.* Here the 'economic interpretation of history' comes in, namely the question of finance. To a large extent the present conference is being financed out of the surplus which still remains from the large special sum raised for the Edinburgh Conference, which the World Council Central Committee agreed to reserve for this purpose. I can see no chance whatsoever of raising any further amounts for further conferences on Faith and Order. We must realise that the amount of money and man-power is limited, and must cut our coat according to our cloth.

These questions have already been discussed in August 1951 at Clarens, and in January 1952 at Lambeth, and the proposals made by those meetings have been considered by the Committee on Structure and Functioning. I would now ask the present conference to appoint a committee to consider the whole question, and should be glad if this meeting would express any opinions which it thinks that committee ought to bear in mind during the coming week.

As no delegates asked to speak at this point, the President proposed the election of the Committee on the Future of Faith and Order; after Dr. Visser 't Hooft's speech (see below) another proposal was put from the Chair to elect a Committee on the Theme for the Evanston Assembly and possible Message to the Churches.

Votes were taken and the committees were elected unanimously, with membership as recorded in Appendix 4 on pp. 349-51.

The President then invited the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches to address the conference upon the work of Faith and Order in relation to the Assembly in 1954.

FAITH AND ORDER AND THE
SECOND ASSEMBLY OF THE WORLD COUNCIL
OF CHURCHES

DR. W. A. VISSER 'T HOOFT

Introduction

The Faith and Order Executive Committee has asked me to make an introductory statement concerning the place of Faith and Order in the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches and the preparations which Faith and Order should

make for that Assembly. And this matter is brought before you at an early stage so that the necessary action may be taken in good time. I will therefore have to speak especially about the plans made for the Second Assembly and the theme which has been suggested as the Faith and Order theme to be included in the programme of the Second Assembly. But I would like to provide some background for our discussion of these matters by a few remarks on the relation of Faith and Order to the ecumenical movement as a whole and the World Council of Churches in particular.

Faith and Order within the World Council

We have no time to review the whole history of the relations between Faith and Order and other branches of the ecumenical movement. But in order to see the present situation in the right perspective it is useful to remind ourselves of the fact that in the early years of the ecumenical movement there was in many circles a very real fear that the discussion of matters of Faith and Order would disrupt the co-operation between the Churches which was just beginning. At that time a number of councils of Churches were formed with the explicit understanding that matters of Faith and Order should not be brought up in their midst. And for those who are interested in historical comparisons it is worth noting that it was quite near Lund in Hälsingborg that about thirty years ago a Faith and Order approach concerning joint planning for the time and place of the Life and Work and Faith and Order Conferences was answered with the dictum: 'Service unites, but doctrine divides.' In the particular situation of those days the fear of a direct attack upon the fundamental differences between the Churches can perhaps be understood. To-day such a fear can only be considered as a pure anachronism. For we have had the opportunity to learn that so far from weakening our fellowship, a frank and penetrating confrontation of our convictions is the only way to arrive at the deeper level of fellowship, the only level which is worthy of the Christian Church. Thus Life and Work was forced to enter into the theological realm in the years before its Oxford Conference. Thus the World Council's first Assembly at Amsterdam had to concern itself with the very real issues of the different understandings of the nature of the Church. Thus the young World Council had to tackle in its second year

the thorny problem of the ecclesiological significance of its own existence. And thus the International Missionary Council at its recent meeting at Willingen took a bold step forward by declaring that National Christian Councils should consider afresh their responsibility in relation to the cause of Christian unity within their own areas. Thus we can say that the concern which Faith and Order set out to represent has slowly but surely penetrated the life of the ecumenical movement as a whole.

But that does not mean that the task of Faith and Order is accomplished. On the contrary, that gives Faith and Order a greater responsibility than ever before. The ecumenical movement looks in a new way to Faith and Order to give it a lead in those matters upon which the whole life of the movement ultimately depends. Nevertheless there are large sections of our Churches in all parts of the world which have not yet understood that co-operation is not enough. There are still many who think of the present relationship of our Churches in the World Council of Churches as an end rather than as a beginning, as a solution of the problem of unity rather than as a first step on the road to unity. The danger of this is that, in the words of the present Archbishop of Canterbury, the World Council can thus become a narcotic rather than a stimulant. We must react against this temptation of accepting the present established disorder of our ecclesiastical world simply because it has been made to look less shocking as it has been provided with an ecumenical varnish.

And so we look to Faith and Order which has undertaken the hardest of all ecumenical tasks to show the way that leads beyond mere co-operation, yes and beyond the present very imperfect ecumenical pattern, to a true unity which will make it clear to the whole world that as there can only be one Body of Christ, so there *is* only one Body which is the Church of His People.

Concerning the Second Assembly

I pass on to the presentation of the plans for the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches which is to be held in 1954 in Evanston (Illinois).

A *second* Assembly! That very combination of words indicates the difficulty of our undertaking. For the Amsterdam Assembly had the enormous advantage of being the first Assembly and was

largely carried by the fact that it brought the Churches together in this new way. The second Assembly is a meeting of a body which has entered into the history of the Church and even of the world, which has its weaknesses as well as its strength, and which is rightly judged not by its good intentions but by its actual witness in word and deed. Moreover, the second Assembly will meet in a time when it is still far harder than it was in 1948 to be a *World Council of Churches*. Tensions have grown and instead of the *one* world about which we heard so much at the end of the last war, we have now a series of worlds which find it increasingly difficult to find any common basis of understanding or action. Will our attempts to maintain the spiritual unity of our fellowship as between Christians in Eastern Europe and China on the one hand and those in other nations succeed, or are the forces of misunderstanding too strong for the Church? Will we succeed in our attempt in India next January to arrive at a real meeting of minds between Asian Christians and those from the West? We do not know.

In those circumstances it seems a rash thing indeed to choose as our main theme for the Assembly: 'The Christian Hope'. The extremely lively discussion which is taking place about this theme and in the course of which we hear this theme strongly attacked and strongly defended would seem to indicate that instead of choosing a universally acceptable theme we have chosen a highly controversial one. But the truth of the matter is that this theme has chosen us. When in Toronto there arose among us a strong conviction that in this time of fear of the future and doubt about the meaning of human existence we were called to proclaim the word of *hope*, we did not at first realise the implications of our action. It was only as we came to reflect more deeply about what the Churches on the basis of the New Testament must say about hope, that we realised fully how challenging this theme would prove to be for the Churches and indeed for all concerned. At the same time once we have been led upon this road we cannot and we do not want to retreat, for it is a road on which we make crucial discoveries. It is not as if some group of people had suddenly decided to impose some eschatological theory upon the ecumenical movement. It is simply that we are called to speak about the Christian Hope, that we realise again the truth: '*Ave Crux, Spes Unica*', and that in

trying to speak adequately, that is biblically, about this truth we cannot avoid the theme of eschatology.

But let no one think that the realities of this world will be forgotten at Evanston. Our speaking about hope would be meaningless if it were not done in constant reference and relevance to the present situation of the world. Moreover, there are the very practical subsidiary themes.

The plan is that the main theme should be considered during the first week of the Assembly and that the subsidiary themes be dealt with during the second week. There will be six of these as follows: The Faith and Order theme; evangelism—the mission of the Church to those outside its life; the laity—the Christian in his vocation; social questions—the responsible society in a world perspective; international affairs—Christians in the struggle for world community; inter-group relations—the Church and racial and ethnic tensions.

For most of these themes introductory pamphlets have already been prepared. And for each theme there will be a preparatory commission which will have the task of producing a factual survey concerning the thought and work of the Churches in this particular field and also to work on a first basic draft of an Assembly report on the subject. This draft will of course only have the status of a useful starting point for the work of the Assembly sections themselves. They are meant to present the best possible technical preparation of the discussions at Evanston, but the Assembly itself will decide what use it will make of them.

There has never been any doubt that one of the themes of the Second Assembly should be a Faith and Order subject. The Assemblies of the World Council of Churches are the occasions when we try to present to the Churches and to the world the *whole* ecumenical movement and remind each other of our *whole* ecumenical task. And this means obviously that the concern for the visible unity of the Church must have a central place in our deliberations. Again the Assembly is the occasion for Faith and Order to speak to many church leaders and church members who have as yet little understanding of the crucial importance and the baffling difficulty of the Faith and Order task and so to gain new recruits for the army of servants of the cause of Christian unity. There are therefore strong reasons why we should take the Faith and Order participation in the Assembly very seriously. But

there remains the question *how* the concern of Faith and Order can best be brought into the Assembly. What we need is a subject sufficiently central and crucial to challenge the Churches to redouble their efforts for real unity, but not so technically theological that it can only be understood by a relatively small number of experts.

Basic Agreements which We have Reached

Now in order to determine what that subject should be, it is useful to state as briefly as possible what are some of the basic agreements which we have reached in the course of our ecumenical discussions of the last years and what are the points which need to be clarified. If we take the first Assembly as our starting point, we must say that that Assembly was not so very significant in what it had to *say* about the nature of our unity, but very significant in that it created a new *fact*, a new situation, namely that the Churches in and through the World Council entered into what the Amsterdam message called a covenant, a fellowship of a permanent character. As so often in the history of the Church the spiritual fact preceded the theological reflection. For at that time it was only dimly perceived just what the new fact meant.

Amsterdam echoed the absolutely fundamental conviction which Söderblom had already stated in the twenties and for which Temple found such a clear formulation at Edinburgh (1937), namely that 'we could not seek union if we did not already possess unity. Those who have nothing in common do not deplore their estrangement. It is because we are one in allegiance to one Lord that we seek and hope for the way of manifesting that unity in our witness to Him before the world. . . . It is only by coming closer to Him that we come closer to one another.' It seems almost an echo of Temple's words when the Amsterdam message affirms: 'When we draw closer to Christ we draw more closely together.' But while we declared that we had found a measure of real unity we did not say what the nature of that unity was and how it was related to our denominational loyalties and convictions.

At Toronto two years later we tried to go a step further by explaining to ourselves and to others that the relationship in and through the World Council does not mean a general ecclesiastical

relativism, that the Council does *not* force the Churches into any compromises, that every Church which is ready to enter into relations of conversation and co-operation with other Churches on the World Council basis can do so without prejudice to its understanding of its own nature. And we stated positively that we are a body which seeks to prepare the way for manifest, tangible unity, because that is clearly what the New Testament understands by unity. That, on the other hand, we did not have any preconceived idea as to the form which such unity should take.

But once again we did not have much to say about that other related question: what then is the nature of the unity we have already found in our togetherness?

A third important development was the discussions in Rolle and in Willingen on 'Mission and Unity'. For it made explicit that the seeking for unity cannot mean a withdrawal into church-centredness, but is an indispensable part of the accomplishment of the witnessing task of the Church in and to the world. Willingen put this very forcefully: 'Division in the Church distorts its witness, frustrates its mission, and contradicts its own nature. If the Church is to demonstrate the Gospel in its life as well as in its preaching, it must manifest to the world the power of God to break down all barriers and to establish the Church's unity in Christ.' And again: 'We believe that through the ecumenical movement God is drawing His people together in order that He may enable us to discern yet more clearly the contradictions in our message and the barriers to unity which are also hindrances to effective witness in a divided world. We can no longer be content to accept our divisions as normal.' But once again there remains the unanswered question: what then is our situation to-day, what is the significance of the unity, however incomplete it may be, which has already been given to us?

Further Clarification Needed

This then is the question which arises most sharply in the present ecumenical situation: How can we do full justice to the two apparently contradictory aspects of our present condition, namely that there is a unity in Christ which has been and is being given to us and that we are at the same time still divided from each other? It is clear that *both* aspects are important. It does not help to deny the existence of one of the two sides of the dialectical

situation. To talk as some do of the 'World Church' as if it existed as a historical reality to-day is utterly misleading and is to minimise the seriousness of our theological divisions, of our separateness in worship and sacrament, of our organisational self-centredness. On the other hand to talk as if we lived still in an era of complete denominational isolationism, is to forget that in our day and generation for large numbers of Christians something of the reality of the Church Universal has become manifest as the Churches have spoken, acted and lived together.

Our task is then to speak adequately about that intermediate situation in which while having a real unity we have not that greater unity which we believe the Lord desires us to have. In other words we need a theology of the abnormal situation in which we are to-day. The reason why we have not yet been able to think and speak more clearly about these matters is surely that we have clung too exclusively to accepted categories of thought. Thus what we did in Toronto (and what we had to do at that time) was to relate the fact of the World Council to the existing ecclesiologies of the various Churches. We sought to answer the question: how can a Church justify its membership in the World Council of Churches in terms of the traditional ecclesiological convictions of the different confessions? It was necessary to ask and to answer that question. But now we have to ask the next and even more difficult question: how can we give adequate expression to the spiritual reality which exists in the ecumenical movement? And that question cannot be answered in terms of ecclesiologies which do not take any account of even the possibility of such a thing as the ecumenical movement. That question can only be answered as we do a great deal of fresh thinking.

Another reason why we have not advanced as rapidly in this matter as we should have is of course that as soon as we give their due theological weight to the facts of the ecumenical situation we are forced to ask immediately whether our present organisational situation can still be defended. For you cannot speak with conviction about the new and real unity which has grown up among the Churches and complacently accept the fact that our denominational forms of organisation and action continue to give the impression that each denomination remains a law unto itself. And there is a real danger of insincerity which the world with its sharp hearing will easily detect, in speaking one

moment with enthusiasm about the emergence of a 'World Church' and in acting the next moment as if nothing had happened in the relations between the Churches.

There is also need to clarify the relation of the calling of the Church to unity with the Christian Hope. We must confess that in our thinking together about unity so far, we have not yet given its full place to the eschatological dimension of our faith. The Toronto statement, for example, has an eschatological reference in its concluding section, but that reference reminds one a little too much of certain textbooks of Christian doctrine in which the so-called 'last things' are only mentioned in the last few pages when the author seems to have lost his breath. But we have learned—and the report of the Advisory Commission on the Theme of the Second Assembly has made this very clear—that eschatology is not an appendix to our faith, not one among the many articles of our creed, but the indispensable perspective in which we must see our whole existence in this world. We discover increasingly that according to the New Testament the Church has not only something to say *about* eschatology, but that it is itself an eschatological reality, that is to say that it represents the new age and the new creation in the midst of the old age and the old creation. But if that is true, we dare not think about church unity apart from that eschatological quality of the Church. We must learn to think of the Church in more dynamic terms, more as belonging to the new world and the coming age, less in terms of historical, cultural, sociological categories. We must dare to speak of that perpetual *renewal* of the Church which is presupposed in its calling: not to be conformed to this world, but to be transformed by the renewal of its mind. And we must think of this renewal in the radical way in which the New Testament uses that word, that is as participation in the powers of the coming age. Thus only may we hope to get out of the deadlocks into which history has driven us, deadlocks to which many non-theological, cultural, social and political factors have contributed. Thus only may we hope to get moving toward the great goal that all may be one.

The Proposed Theme

It is with these ideas in mind and in the light of this situation that the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches

at its Rolle meeting in 1951 adopted this resolution: 'That the Faith and Order Commission be asked to consider the following proposal: that the Faith and Order topic (at the Second Assembly) be *The Unity which we have in Christ and the Disunity of our Churches* or such similar subject as Faith and Order may decide, recognising that this will follow the Lund meeting and take account of its conclusions, the ecclesiological meaning of the ecumenical movement, the rôle and contribution of confessions, and non-theological factors.'

It should be noted that this resolution is simply a proposal and that this conference can therefore choose another subject or change the formulation of the theme. The only important consideration is that the issue of the unity of the Church should be brought to the Assembly in the clearest, the most challenging and the most relevant manner.

The Task of the Sub-Committee

It seems therefore that the task of the special committee which this conference is asked to appoint is first of all to consider whether the subject tentatively suggested by the Central Committee is indeed the most important issue in the realm of Faith and Order which can be chosen for consideration by the Second Assembly or whether some other issue should be proposed. Once the Committee has decided on the theme it will further have to consider how this theme can best be presented in the series of pre-Assembly leaflets which will be issued in the near future, what further preparatory material should be produced and what group should be given the responsibility of preparing the basic draft for the Assembly report on the Faith and Order subject.

A Lund Message?

The Executive Committee also proposes that this same sub-committee should consider whether in addition to the reports which will grow out of the work of the sections this conference should issue a special message to the Churches. It is by no means a foregone conclusion that we should issue such a message. The Lausanne Message and the Edinburgh *Affirmation of Unity* were issued in a period when ecumenical statements were still relatively rare, while we are meeting in a period of an almost frightening increase of ecumenical meetings most of which address the

Churches and the world in one way or another. In this respect it is good to hold on to the principle that we should only speak if we feel constrained to do so. On the other hand we must not exclude the possibility that we may be led together to a common conviction about the whole situation in which we find ourselves after some twenty-five years of discussions on Faith and Order. Or it may be that we feel that the ground needs to be prepared for the contribution which we want to bring to the Assembly.

CHAPTER 3

THE TEMPLE OF THE LORD



The report of the Theological Commission on Intercommunion had prepared the minds of delegates for the problems of the Lord's Supper in a divided Church. That report had made clear the existence of deep, conscientious difficulties which make united eucharistic worship impossible in a gathering as widely representative as was the Lund Conference. But it also suggested that at all ecumenical conferences there should be 'provision for a corporate expression of penitence for our divided state. This is generally best provided through a carefully prepared *joint* service of preparation. . . .'¹ The suggestion was adopted by the Conference Committee on Worship, and a form of service prepared, in all three conference languages, which clearly followed the lines of a similar service at the Amsterdam Assembly in 1948. The service was held in the Cathedral at 8.30 p.m. on Saturday, August 16th.

After the opening prayer (the collect for Purity) and the singing of 'Veni Creator', the Dean of Lund read a lesson (I Cor. 11.23-33) and the hymn 'O Sacred Head' was sung. Dr. Perry Gresham (Disciples of Christ, U.S.A.) read Psalm 51; Archbishop Rinkel (Old Catholic Church of Holland) led a confession of sins and read an absolution, drawn from the Old Catholic rite; all then joined in the Lord's Prayer. The hymn 'Make me a captive, Lord' was sung, and followed by the sermon printed below. After it, Father Philipos (Orthodox Syrian Church of Malabar) read a prayer drawn from Eastern liturgical sources. The hymn 'Thine is the glory' (*À toi la gloire*) was then sung, and the service concluded with a blessing pronounced by Archbishop Walter Barfoot, Primate of the Church of England in Canada.

SERMON BY PROFESSOR DONALD M. BAILLIE, D.D.

To make ready a people prepared for the Lord (Luke 1.17).

That beloved Scottish preacher of the days of my youth, John Kelman, began his book on his travels in Palestine with this

¹ See Report of the Preparatory Commission on *Intercommunion*, p. 28.

sentence: 'A journey through the Holy Land may reasonably be expected to be in some sort a sacramental experience in a man's life.' But he knew very well how misleading and dangerous such an expectation may be. On the third page he goes on to speak of the people who expect to find in the sacred sites of the Holy Land some occult and magical qualities which would in themselves communicate a revelation. He takes the notable example of Pierre Loti, who went to Palestine with the hope that some experience might there be given him which would revive his lost faith in Christianity. Loti was bitterly disappointed and disillusioned; and finally, he tells us, in the Garden of Gethsemane, he stood beating his brow in the darkness against the stem of an olive-tree, waiting for something to happen. But nothing happened. There was no revelation. And he cried in despair: 'No, there is nothing. No one sees me. No one answers me.' In the landscapes of Palestine, even though they were the scene and setting of the Word-made-flesh, there was nothing that could speak to one who did not bring a mind made ready by faith and prepared for the Lord.

A visit to the Holy Land is not a sacrament at all, and in the proper sense perhaps should not even be called sacramental. And yet we have here an extraordinarily good parable of what is true even of the sacraments of the Gospel. And that is why, looking forward to the celebration of Holy Communion to-morrow morning, we are here to-night for a service of preparation.

It is a common experience for Christians to come to a communion service and find that their hearts cannot rise to the height of the occasion. The familiar sacred words are spoken, the bread is broken and the wine is poured out, and they receive the elements. But they are unable to lift up their hearts unto the Lord. The hour passes, and they go away, with the sense that they have not opened their hearts to the grace of God or offered the sacrifice of thanksgiving. Now, it may very well be that they are making the elementary mistake of taking their momentary emotions as the test of their worship. It may be that though they had no sense of enjoying the presence of God, He was feeding them with bread from Heaven. But it may also be that the sacrament was not truly sacramental to them because they did not receive it in faith, since, as St. Augustine said, we cannot carry away from the sacrament more than we can collect in the

vessel of faith. And it may be that the reason why their faith was dormant and sluggish, and even perhaps their attention wandering, was because they had not taken the trouble to prepare themselves for the sacrament, that they might come to it 'made ready as a people prepared for the Lord'.

But why should we have to prepare ourselves beforehand for what is intended in itself to be to us a means of grace? To speak of preparing our hearts for it may seem to suggest that the sacrament depends on us, on our subjective frame of mind, on our being able to induce the appropriate thoughts and feelings. Whereas the very meaning of a sacrament is that God is waiting to be gracious to us, with a prevenient grace which does not depend upon us, and with supernatural gifts which only He can give and we can only receive. Yes, indeed. God has given us this sacrament to enable us to look away from ourselves to Him, not gazing inwards upon our own souls, but outwards upon His grace and mercy and peace, which are as near and as real as the bread that is placed in our hands. And even the faith by which we receive these gifts is not of our making, but is His gift bestowed on our empty hands.

But even God's greatest gifts, even His own comings to us—do they call for no preparation? When God Himself, once for all, came right into our human situation, to visit and redeem His people in the Word-made-flesh, did He come without a call for preparation? Nay, the beautiful words which I announced as my text would never have been written if it had not been necessary to make preparation for that greatest of all divine comings, 'to make ready a people prepared for the Lord'. The words were spoken with reference to the mission of John the Baptist. And is it not a very notable thing that the four Gospels all take that mission of John as their starting-point in telling the story of the Ministry of Jesus. That was indeed 'the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ'. The story could not be told without that beginning, and it is uniformly regarded by the Evangelists as a divinely appointed *preparation* for Christ. Even when God visited and redeemed His people in the Word-made-flesh, in that central and living sacrament which is Jesus Christ Himself, a preparation was needed—'to prepare in the desert a highway for our God', to 'make ready a people prepared for the Lord'. That is how God works; and it is not strange that the Church has always called its

members to prepare themselves for the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

But these words of our text carry us further, and suggest in three ways the kind of preparation we ought to be making to-night.

1. In the first place, it ought to be an act of *penitence*. The preparation for Christ's coming in the flesh was a baptism of repentance. That was how John became a forerunner to prepare the way of the Lord. And so it must be with us as we prepare for the Lord's Supper. I said a moment ago that when we celebrate the sacrament we should not have our eyes turned inwards upon ourselves, but outward towards God. 'Lift up your hearts.' 'We lift them up unto the Lord.' That is indeed what we must do when we come to His Table: the sacred symbols must draw our gaze away from ourselves to Christ in all the reality of His love and power. Yes, but if we are to look away from ourselves *then*, we must look at ourselves *now*. 'Let a man examine himself', says St. Paul, 'and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup'; and now is the time for that humble and penitent self-examination. 'Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that in due time he may lift you up.' And now in this time of preparation, this eve of the Lord's Day, we must in His holy and gracious presence humble our hearts in contrition and repentance for our sins, in order that, when the time comes at the Holy Table to-morrow morning, we may be able to lift them up unto the Lord.

2. In the second place, our text reminds us that our preparation of repentance is not only individual, but *corporate*: 'to make ready a people prepared for the Lord'. *A people*. The whole plot of the story of God's redemptive work among men, as it is told in the Bible, is concerned not with isolated individuals, but with a people. In the Old Testament it was the people of Israel, that was a people for God's own possession, chosen by Him to be His servant and to show forth His glory in the world. In the New Testament it was no less a people, the New Israel of God, the Church of Christ. God 'visited and redeemed His people', calling men and women of every tribe and tongue and people and nation to be a chosen race, a holy nation, a peculiar people, a kingdom of priests in His service—the Church of Christ.

And does He not then deal with us as individuals? Yes, indeed,

He does. He seeks out each one of us for our salvation. But the very thing from which we need to be saved is the self-centred individualism which separates us, each one, from God and man, and which is the essence of sin. We need to be saved from our selfish isolated selves. And God saves us by calling us back into community with Himself and with our fellows through that redeemed community which is the Body of Christ, His Church, and which keeps the Festival of His broken Body.

We must indeed, each one for himself, make preparation for the sacrament in the secret place of our inner chamber, in the presence of the Father who sees in secret, and that is what we are so often tempted to neglect. But when to-morrow we come to God's heavenly altar, we shall compass it as a people, a kingdom of priests, to make our corporate sacrifice of thanksgiving to God. And we must come 'made ready as a people prepared for the Lord', with one heart and with one soul. And in order that we may be able to do it, we are here together to-night to make our corporate act of preparation and repentance.

But these two things that I have said become far more significant when we put them together, and then they lead to a third:

3. In the third place, our penitence on this occasion must be above all else an act of penitence for the divided state of the Church of Christ, for our separation from one another.

How can we be 'made ready as a people prepared for the Lord' when we are divided, separated from each other? How can we be a people for God's own possession when we are not a people, but a multitude of sects which cannot all even meet as communicants at the Lord's Table? Surely, then, this must be a dominant note of our preparation to-night for our communion to-morrow—the note of repentance for our breach of the unity of the body of Christ. That is something upon which we can all agree. Not one of us wishes to be disloyal to the traditions of our past. Not one of us would forget that when our forefathers separated from each other they did it in obedience to what they believed to be the demands of truth. Not one of us would wish to reduce the infinite variety of Christian truth and life to a barren uniformity. And not one of us will pretend that the problem of the reunion of the Church is a simple problem, or that the way forward is a perfectly plain path. But we shall all agree that there is something deeply tragic and sinful in the

present divided state of the Church, and that we cannot wash our hands of responsibility for the blindness and narrowness, the pride and jealousy, the lack of charity and of zeal for the Kingdom of Christ, which have resulted from our divisions and which are helping even now to perpetuate them.

If these things are true, then what better can we do to-night than make an act of penitence together for the things that separate us from each other? It may be that because of our divisions some are looking forward with a certain amount of perplexity and anxiety to that great service to-morrow in which so many persons of widely diverse traditions will be united at the Lord's Table. But how can we better prepare for it than by asking God to turn our anxiety, which separates us, into the true contrition and forgiveness which can unite us; not the sorrow of the world, which worketh death, but the godly sorrow which is unto repentance and salvation? And then as we look forward to tomorrow, we can pray this other prayer:

O send out Thy light and Thy truth; Let them lead us, let them bring us unto Thy holy hill and to Thy tabernacles. Then will we go unto the altar of God, unto God our exceeding joy. . . . For we shall yet praise Him, who is the health of our countenance and our God.

Sunday, August 17th

Although the Conference as such had no programme arranged for it on the first Sunday morning, the *Handbook* contained the following announcement:

'The authorities of the Church of Sweden have announced that all members of the Conference will be welcome at the SERVICE OF HIGH MASS WITH COMMUNION in the Cathedral at 10.00 hrs. and may receive the Sacrament at that service if they so desire. The Bishop of Lund, Dr. Anders Nygren, will preach.'

The Cathedral was packed with a vast congregation, and very large numbers, including the great majority of the conference delegates, received the Holy Communion. Since the full text of the Swedish High Mass and its music is reproduced in the tri-lingual *Venite Adoremus I*, those unfamiliar with Swedish were able to follow the service

closely. It is clear from subsequent comments that the service made a very deep impression, and for all present, whether conscientiously able to be communicants or not, it became one of the supreme memories of the conference period.

After the tradition of the Swedish Church, a short sermon was preached at the beginning of the service 'moving the congregation to confession of sins, in preparation for Holy Communion'. A summary of this address, by the Dean, Dr. Bolander, is printed below, followed by the text of the sermon preached after the Creed by the Bishop of Lund, Dr. Anders Nygren.

ADDRESS BY THE DEAN OF LUND,
DR. NILS BOLANDER

Jesus said: Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her (Luke 10.42).

The Church at work—with this motto the Church of Sweden some years ago had an exhibition in Stockholm that attracted much attention.

The Church at work—it could be an impressive presentation, a splendid display, pulsating with life. It could show the manifold aspects of the Church's work—missions, social work, ecumenical activity, women's meetings, Sunday schools, youth work, education, laymen's work, and so on.

The Holy Scripture likes to speak of the Christian life in terms of work, of expansion. The Master Himself strikes the note: 'I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work.'

The Apostle Paul, who 'laboured more abundantly than they all', speaks about doing work that brings forth fruit and thanks God for his friends in Philippi because of their work in the Gospel 'from the first day until now'.

The Church at work—Martha's work—it is something good and blessed, necessary and vitally important. Faith without works is dead.

And yet—there is another motto that is even more important, which is the condition for a Church at work, without which a Church at work becomes a bustling and panting Church being so busy and doing so little. This motto is: The Church hears.

If the Church neglects to hear she becomes a Sardis of which

it is said that 'thou hast a name, that thou livest and art dead'. This side of the life of the Church, the inward joy, we cannot bring to an exhibition. It cannot be recorded as if it were a work performed. The New Testament likes to fasten the attention on this hearing, this quietness and inwardness. It is the heart of everything central in the work of the Church, that good part, Mary's service.

The heart of the Christian life, the gospel in the Gospels, is this assurance for a tired and harassed soul: that there is on this earth a place where a sinner may come and lie down, take off his whole harness of anxiety, all his troubled thoughts and painful self-reproachments, all his agony and need and all his manifold everyday worries, and where he is able to find rest, blessed peace, real rest: the rock of Golgotha, where Christ suffered death that we may live.

To be saved is strictly speaking nothing more and nothing less than to find rest in this way in the promises of grace.

Dear communicants, when we, labourers and servants in the Church at work, in this moment of quietness approach the Holy Supper at the altar of this cathedral of Lund, it is in order to receive, in the divine stillness before the Almighty, instructions for service, and to obtain a new power for an even more whole-hearted and urgent Martha-service, a service that takes all our strength. Only a Church that persistently hears the Word of God is able in the long run to be a Church that works with a vision of victory.

Only if you and I rest in God—in daily listening and daily confession of sins—are we able to hurry to our daily occupations and 'finish our course with joy'. Let us now humbly confess our sins.

(*The Confession* from the Swedish Liturgy then followed.)

SERMON BY BISHOP ANDERS NYGREN

The Gospel passage for to-day which we have just heard used to have the title, 'Jesus weeps over Jerusalem'. We would perhaps do better to give it another title: 'Jesus and the Temple.' But if so, we should take care to read the text in its context, and perceive that it puts a very urgent and personal question to us. When we hear about Jesus and the Temple we ourselves are faced by the

question: and we—what about us? Let us for a short while consider this subject: Jesus and the Temple—and its meaning for us.

If we read our New Testament carefully we shall soon discover how closely the whole life of Jesus is bound up with the Temple. The child Jesus was brought there. There from the very beginning His life was dedicated to the Lord. And from the mouth of the boy of twelve we listen to these words about the Temple: 'How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?' To Jesus the Temple was His 'Father's house'.

Our text takes us to the last days of Jesus' life on earth, and again it is about Jesus and the Temple. Three facts strike us:

1. Jesus cleanses the Temple.
2. Jesus teaches in the Temple.
3. Jesus builds the new Temple.

1. The story of how Jesus cleansed the Temple occurs at different places in the Gospels. In the Gospel according to St. John we find it right at the beginning of Jesus' ministry. The cleansing of the Temple is one of His first acts. In the other Gospels we find it at the end of His ministry. It is one of His last acts. There is something symbolical in this fact. His whole work is, as it were, framed by the cleansing of the Temple. From the beginning to the end He was burning with zeal for the house of God and it was this zeal that at last, as the Psalm says, 'hath eaten me up'.

Jesus cleanses the Temple—but we, what are we doing? When Jesus with a scourge drove out of the Temple those who desecrated His Father's house, He explained His act with a quotation from Scripture: 'It is written: My house shall be called the house of prayer'; but, He adds, 'ye have made it a den of thieves, an house of merchandise'. When we hear these words we do not perhaps immediately realise that they apply to us. We have not desecrated the house of God in the same way. But if we examine them more carefully, we shall soon realise that they are directed at us also. The house of God ought to be a house of prayer, where we lift up our hands in prayer to God, where we stand empty-handed, prepared to receive His gifts. But we, how have we treated God's house? Perhaps not as a den of thieves, but as a sort of market place. Our worldly and distracted thoughts, our slothfulness and indifference, these things are out of place in the house of God, in

a house of prayer, where our hearts ought to be burning within us, if we take seriously what is told us there. Truly, within us must be cleansed also.

But we should not leave it at that. Even when we take our worship seriously, we must consider the question: what sort of worship have we offered? Even the word 'service' itself is ambiguous—it might mean that it is we who render our services to God, we who give Him gifts by our service. No, if our service is to be real, we must realise that the Temple is a house of prayer, where it is God who comes to us with His gifts and where we meet Him with empty hands. But human as we are, we find it hard to put away our pride and self-righteousness. They cling to us even in the Temple and seek to make even our service an act of merit. They prevent us from praying simply like the publican, 'God be merciful to me a sinner', and then to receive the justification of God as a gift. Truly, amongst us also a cleansing of the Temple is needed. We need, as is said in Heb. 9.14, to purge our conscience from dead works and serve the living God.

2. Jesus teaches in the Temple. 'And he taught daily in the Temple.' These are the last words of our text. God's temples and sanctuaries stand all over the world. Why? For the sake of the Gospel. In order that the glad tidings of Christ the Saviour shall reach all people. Christ Himself is present in His Word. And His Word is not powerless, indeed, 'it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth'.

Christ is present in the temple. He is there through His Word and His redeeming power. And we, what are we doing? People greedily absorb every little news item, as if everything depended on it. But when God sends us the great, world-shaking news of Christ, upon which the destiny of the human race really hangs, we do not seem able to grasp this message. Christ speaks to us in the temple: 'He that hath ears to hear let him hear.'

3. Jesus builds the new temple. When Jesus was brought before the High Priest, false witnesses came and said: 'This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it again in three days.' This witness was false; and yet it contained an element of truth. When Israel rejected their Messiah, the judgment fell upon the people, the city of Jerusalem and the Temple. That is why Jesus weeps over the city. That is why He predicts the destruction of the Temple: 'The day will come, in which there

shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.' The old temple, built by man and only a shadow and prototype of that to come, had to be broken down and utterly destroyed. It had to give place to a new and more glorious temple, a temple not made with hands. When Jesus' earthly life ended in death, the era of the old temple passed away. And when He rose, the foundations of the new temple were laid. St. John the Evangelist tells how Jesus said to the Jews: 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.' 'But', the Evangelist adds, 'he spake of the temple of his body.' He spoke of His own Resurrection and of His Church. Because the Church is the body of Christ. When Christ rose from the dead on the third day, the new temple that He had come to build arose with Him, the temple, in which He Himself is the crown and the chief corner stone, 'in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord'.

And we—what about us? The answer is in the words of Grundtvig's hymn:

'We are the temple of our Lord
built of living stones. . . .'

As the Apostle says, 'Ye are God's house. . . . Know ye not that ye are the temple of God and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you? For the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.' Here we stand at the very climax. Christ, the temple and ourselves—all three are one single great unity. The new temple is Jesus Christ Himself; but we also are the new temple. It may sound daring and unbelievable to say so, yet it is nothing but the simple truth. When Christ rose on the third day, the new temple rose with Him; and now we, one after another, are built up as living stones into this temple. From every people and nation and tongue the materials are gathered. They are brought together and become one in Christ. And thus it is that the temple grows higher and higher up to Christ, who is both its unity and its crown.

It is a wonderful vision of a wonderful reality that has been given us: Christ's *one* great Church, in which we are all fitted together, all united in Him. Thus is Christ this very day building His temple.

And *we*—what about us? Do we not tend to pull down what He is building up, to divide, where He wants to gather and unite? Already the New Testament warns us against divisions. The Apostle asks: 'Is Christ divided?' When we look at Christendom to-day, we have even more reason to ask this question. What kind of a temple are we building? Is it a temple made with hands? When everybody thinks only of his own little temple, Christendom goes to pieces. But when the great vision of the unity of Christ's Church has been granted to us, how then can we stand divided, how then can we be indifferent? We are after all members of the same body, living stones in the same temple, we belong to the same Lord. And when Christ invites all those who are members in His body to receive Himself, when he invites them to His holy Supper, saying, 'This is my body'—how then dare we put human limits to His will for communion and unity? May the Lord open our eyes that we may see His great temple rise, and may He make us of the same mind one with another and one in Him.

To-day we have tangible evidence of this great temple which Christ is building, when we meet our brothers and sisters in Christ, who have been called together from all parts of the world by faith in Jesus Christ, and whom we now welcome among us. May God grant His blessing so that we, joined one with another, may grow up to Christ and to an ever greater and deeper unity in Him.

Let us pray: Come, Holy Ghost, come our God, fill the hearts and minds of Thy faithful with the gift of Thy grace, and kindle in them Thy burning love. By the splendour of Thy light Thou hast called Thy people out of all the nations of the earth. We praise Thy name, O Lord, and say Hallelujah, Hallelujah.

CHAPTER 4

THE TASK OF FAITH AND ORDER IN A PILGRIM CHURCH

★

8 p.m., Sunday, August 17th

The evening saw the conference assemble in plenary session in the University Aula to hear two introductory addresses. The full text of each is given in the following pages.

THE PILGRIM PEOPLE OF GOD BY EDMUND SCHLINK

(translated from the German)

I

The Church is on her way between the first and second Advent of Christ. She is on her pilgrimage towards her Master who is coming again. She does not know what may yet happen to her on this pilgrimage. Yet she is certain that at the end of it stands the Master, Lord of the world, and the conqueror of every adversary. Then He will gather together all who are His, from all nations, from all lands, and from all ages, and with them He will celebrate the great Supper of the Lord. Then, after all the struggle and strife, there will be *one* flock and *one* Shepherd. If St. Paul could write in his own day: 'For now is our salvation nearer than when we believed' (Rom. 13.11), his words are even more relevant at the present time; Christ's coming again is nearer than ever; He will come to redeem His People.

But we must not forget that the Lord will come not only as our Redeemer but also as our Judge, and not merely as the Judge of the world, but also as the Judge of Christendom. 'For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ' (II Cor. 5.10). Then the Lord will say to those on His right hand: 'Come ye blessed of my Father', and to the others: 'Depart from me ye

cursed' (Matt. 25.34,41). At this point He will effect a separation which will go far deeper than any separation made by man. In comparison with the separation wrought at the Day of Judgment our present ecclesiastical divisions are merely temporary, and in spite of their seriousness they are not 'final' in the eschatological sense. For the separation which Christ will effect at the end of the world will cut across *all* Churches. None of the Churches here assembled can count upon remaining undivided then. Even to those who have eaten and drunk in His presence, and have heard His Word (Luke 13.26f.)—even to those who have prophesied in His Name and who have done great deeds—the Lord will say: 'I never knew you, depart from me' (Matt. 7.22f.).

Who will then be saved? Those who are poor in spirit, those who hunger and thirst after righteousness (Matt. 5.3,6), those who watch and wait (Matt. 25.1f.), those who are restless and dissatisfied, knowing that they are strangers in this world, and that here 'there is no abiding city', those who long for Christ, who look for the solution of all problems simply and solely from the coming Lord. But to the rich, the self-satisfied, the scoffers, to all who are at home in this world and love it, Christ says: 'Woe unto you!' (Luke 6.24f.).

We are here assembled as divided Churches. But the Lord who will come again stands before us all, whether we realise it or not. We are already in His net, even if this net has not yet been drawn out of the sea and we may still imagine we are swimming about freely and gaily in the water. Yet we know for certain that the net *will* be drawn out of the water, and the good and the bad fish will be separated (Matt. 13.47f.). However much we may be divided amongst ourselves, we are in fact *one*, because we are all caught in the meshes of the *one* net, and because we shall be delivered into the hands of the *one* Lord, the heavenly Fisherman.

II

This judgment is not only a future one. It is already taking place in many parts of the world and in many parts of Christendom. I am thinking of the immense historical catastrophes and persecutions which God has allowed to fall upon so many of our brethren. With the coming of anti-Christian and ideological

forces which claim the total obedience of all that man is and has, God has already begun to test and sift men, in the eschatological sense. In such times of distress men are tempted to save their own lives by denying Christ's royal claim and by betraying their brethren. In such tribulations and temptations separations of final significance are already taking place. Here the Lord has taken the fan into His hand already in order to separate the wheat from the chaff (Matt. 3.12).

No human being can foresee the result of this separation, springing out of these catastrophes and trials, any more than he can foresee the result of the separation on the Day of Judgment. It may be that then great proud Churches, which seemed to be firmly built, will collapse like a pack of cards, and that only a small Remnant will stand firm in the time of trial and testing. Christian communities which have a reputation for being alive will suddenly prove to be dead (Rev. 3.1). Leading churchmen, to whom Christians used to look for guidance, will suddenly have no more words of relief, comfort and advice for their flocks. Quite unexpected divisions and changes will then take place. The first will be last, and the last first.

At the same time, however, the dividing walls between Churches of different confessions will become strangely transparent. In time of tribulation the standards by which the divided Christian communities have hitherto measured each other will be altered. What is great will be distinguished from what is small, the essential from the non-essential, the *One* from the many. Many things which used to be considered great, important, and essential, which have traditionally divided one Church from another, will then appear small and non-essential. For those who resist the temptation to fall away, and who cleave to Christ, the only Lord of the Church and of the world, in spite of all their trials and tribulations, are only concerned with the future. The past has been swept away in the great upheaval. Their whole desire is set on the coming Redeemer, and their urgent prayer is for the coming of His Kingdom. Thus separated brethren become reunited (as Vladimir Soloviev saw it in his vision of the Anti-christ), and Christian unity now becomes a reality in prison cells, in forced labour camps, and on the way to execution. Thus, in the very midst of the divisions of the present time, Christ is already gathering His People into one.

This unity of the People of God which is experienced in times of great distress is everywhere seen to be a God-given reality, the reality of the presence of Christ. Wherever anyone experiences this, he knows that it is not due to 'escapism', nor to the exigences of an 'emergency situation'; he knows beyond a doubt that this experience is a God-given reality.

III

When we reflect upon these things, it is all the more astonishing to see how little the rest of Christendom has been affected by these events which have thinned the walls that traditionally divide the Churches. Although the rest of Christendom may think with sympathy of the Churches which are suffering persecution, the subjects and the problems with which it is pre-occupied are as a rule quite different from those with which the Churches 'under the Cross' are concerned. Denominational problems too are regarded quite differently; the Churches which are not under persecution are far more bound by tradition than those in the heat of the conflict. In spite of all their sympathy for their persecuted brethren, they cannot imagine themselves in the situation of those brethren; still less can they draw conclusions from it which have a bearing on their own situation.

It is even more astonishing to see how quickly, for so many people, that experience of the unity of the pilgrim People of God fades away, when the time of persecution is over. Even when the church order has been largely destroyed in the catastrophe, they now look back to the former order, as if there were nothing else to be done, they plan to rebuild on the plans of their own past, and in so doing they restore the old ecclesiastical divisions.

Can this experience of unity be so easily forgotten? Can it be simply dismissed with the remark that it was only an exceptional case, an emergency situation which needed 'emergency' treatment? Why cannot we apply the same principles to 'normal' situations as to these extreme situations? Have we forgotten the normal situation of the Church in the world, that consists in being 'foreign' to the world, and therefore misunderstood and opposed, and that it is abnormal to be at peace with the world and in favour with it? In this world the Church is always in an 'extreme' situation, and that is why times of persecution have often been

less dangerous than the times when the Church has had a kind of 'peace-pact' with the world, which respects and guarantees the position that the Church has acquired in the course of its historical development. 'Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you: but rejoice, in as much as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings' (I Pet. 4.12). It is particularly during times of trial that Christians gain first-hand experience, and the 'hope which maketh not ashamed' becomes stronger (Rom. 5.3ff.).

Christendom, in her desire for unity, will have to learn from these her poorest, yet richest, brethren, from these her most despised members who are yet most honoured by God. Although their mouths will often be sealed, their experience itself is an impressive testimony. And if this experience is often hidden from us, nevertheless in the sight of God they are His true people. From them we must learn to look away from the past, and to look forward steadily to the Lord who is coming again. This is the only direction which has any meaning for those who are 'under the Cross'. This forward movement, however, is also the tendency of the whole witness of the early Church. As we hasten forward in this direction we shall see each other with new eyes.

IV

In recent years we have often heard it said that a crisis has arisen in the work of the Commission on Faith and Order. Is there any justification for this remark? If there is such a crisis, it certainly does not consist in a lack of interest in the subject of 'Faith and Order'. On the contrary, this interest has grown considerably in the course of the twenty-five years since the Lausanne Conference. We have only to recall the growth of the Liturgical Movement, and the renewed interest in the sacraments, the ministry and the problem of tradition, which largely transcends confessional barriers.

Further, it is not possible to speak of a lack of *results* in the work done up to date. The divided Churches have become acquainted with each other, and have learnt to regard each other with new eyes. They have come to a clear knowledge of what unites them and of what divides them. The uniting factors have often been experienced as something surprising, overpowering and great,

an insight that will never be lost. To a large extent the estrangement between, and lack of fellowship among, the Churches have now been overcome.

There is also no lack of future *tasks*. Vital subjects, like christology and eschatology, still await thorough study. The same applies to the many problems concerning the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and especially the problem of the unity and diversity of the charismata in the Body of Christ. Apart from this, other important issues, the study of which will shed light upon our discussions, need to receive close attention. I am thinking of the importance of anthropological and philosophical assumptions underlying the thought-forms in which the various Churches make their credal statements. Indeed, the more closely the Churches have approached each other, the more comprehensive has become the task they have to face.

If there is talk of a 'crisis' in the Faith and Order movement, this cannot be ascribed to the fact that its work has been united with the work of the Stockholm and Oxford Conferences under the World Council of Churches since 1948. For the Study Department in Geneva, which has grown out of the work of the Life and Work movement, has to such a happy degree become concerned with genuine theology and with biblical foundations that its work and that of the Commission on Faith and Order complement each other admirably.

Yet in spite of all this there may be some truth in speaking of a 'crisis'. For the Faith and Order movement finds itself, it seems to me, in a crisis concerning its method. This method has been a systematic and comprehensive interdenominational comparison, by which we tried to elaborate a maximum of the faith we all hold in common. This method was improved at Amsterdam in so far as not only the agreements and disagreements were studied, but also the 'agreements within the disagreements' and the 'disagreements within the agreements'. This method may be even further improved and it will also remain indispensable for the future. Nevertheless we have now arrived at a limit in the use of this method. It led at first to surprising results of far-reaching agreement; however, with increasing exactness in its application, this method has also led us to perceive, more clearly than we had done in the enthusiasm of the ecumenical movement in its early days, the depth of our differences. It could not have been

otherwise, because this method of comparison is a statistical method. It presupposes a certain static structure in the Churches which are to be compared with one another. It does not reckon with changes, and does not demand sacrifices from the Churches involved. On the contrary, by the constitution of the World Council each Church has a guarantee of her rights to be and remain as she is. I am convinced that we have reached a quite natural limit in the use of the comparative method in our work for Faith and Order, and that this way will lead us no further. On the contrary, this way, which does not demand any sacrifices from those involved, will present us with increasing difficulties.

Ecumenical work has also been faced with a crisis because of what God Himself is doing amongst the divided Churches in many countries. This goes far beyond the result of even a most careful statistical comparison. This divine challenge consists, on the one hand, in the new unity which has originated amongst our oppressed and persecuted brethren, and on the other hand in the message of the younger Churches, who are determined to 'forget those things which are behind' and to 'reach forth to those things which are before' (Phil. 3.13), who have left historical traditions behind, and strive after the unity which is in harmony with the One Lord, who is coming forth to meet us. Here real changes are actually taking place. Here traditional characteristics are being sacrificed. And behold, these sacrifices prove to be the reception of riches, they prove to be such blessings that they cannot even be called sacrifices.

The crisis in the Faith and Order movement might be described as the fact that the vanguard of the pilgrim Church of God seems to be further ahead, in practice, than our theory would warrant. When we look at what is actually happening in many countries to-day, in the enthusiastic effort to reach the goal God has set before us, all that we have done hitherto often seems theoretical, slow, and still too much concentrated upon the past.

V

In making this criticism, however, we must not overlook the fact that the Churches assembled in World Council conferences have already taken an enormous and revolutionary step forward, as can be seen in their various, repeated and solemn declarations

of unity in Christ. After Lausanne, Oxford and Edinburgh, they again confessed at Amsterdam: 'We praise God and thank Him for a mighty work of His Holy Spirit, by which we have been drawn together to discover that, notwithstanding our divisions, we are one in Jesus Christ' (Report of Section I). This witness of unity in Christ by the Churches has been an advance of the greatest significance. What has happened here?

Is this proclamation of unity merely a rhetorical statement which is meant to cover the shame and disgrace of disunited Christendom? No. Is it only the expression of a hope, merely stating an aim yet to be reached? No. The answer to this question was already given at Oxford in 1937: 'Our unity in Christ is not a theme for aspiration; it is an experienced fact' (Message to the Christian Churches). It is a present reality.

But in what sense is this unity a present reality? Is it only present in each denomination to which the individual delegates belong? No, for it has been confessed by all together as 'our unity'. Is this unity visible to everybody? Is it reality in the strict empirical sense? No, it is not that either, for the Christians who have confessed their unity in Christ belong to divided Churches, many of which are not in communion with one another.

Then it is a rhetorical statement after all? No. The confession of unity is a witness of faith which transcends all that is visible and which cleaves to Jesus Christ, who beyond all divisions and beyond all our understanding is the One Lord who rules His People and is active among them at the present time.

The proclamation of unity in Christ, in spite of our visible divisions, is a statement of *faith*, like the statement about the death of our sinful nature in baptism. 'Know ye not that as many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ were baptised into his death?' Know ye not 'that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin'? 'Likewise reckon ye also yourselves dead unto sin but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord' (Rom. 6.3,6,11). All this is true, even if we do not see it. As baptised persons we have 'died unto sin', even if we daily admit that we are sinners, and have every reason to ask Our Father who is in heaven to forgive us our trespasses. As our belief that in baptism we have died with Christ unto sin transcends the obstacle of our visible sins, as in our belief in the Crucified we are certain that as sinners

we are justified before God, so we are also certain that in spite of all our divisions we are one in Christ. And as the certainty of death unto sin is based upon the fact of baptism, so the certainty of unity is based upon the experience we have had in our meetings, namely, upon the fact that beyond all divisions we have heard the voice of the One Good Shepherd speaking through the lips of those assembled together with us, comforting and exhorting us. This mutual witness to Christ expressed the fact that we are baptised into the One Christ. In other words: in the encounter between our Churches we have mutually learnt something of that which the Toronto declaration on the self-understanding of the World Council of Churches has described as *vestigia ecclesiae*.

VI

But the very recognition of unity may lead to a crisis in ecumenical work. God always desires His invisible act of grace to take shape in the lives of those upon whom it has been bestowed. The indicative of the divine act of salvation always carries within itself the imperative which demands obedience to the act of salvation. Since we have died with Christ in baptism, we ought to walk in newness of life (Rom. 6.4). 'Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?' (Rom. 6.12). For the baptised person to remain in sin would not only be an anachronism, but would involve serious guilt. Yet that which applies to the baptised individual applies also to the community of the baptised: are we to remain divided in order that unity may become all the more powerful? God forbid. Can we who have known and confessed our unity in Christ ever want to live in division? The Lausanne Conference was absolutely justified in saying: 'We can never again be the same as we were before' (The Call to Unity). But have we really become different from what we were before?

We cannot proclaim our unity again and again, and at the same time remain divided. The indicative of the recognised unity contains at the same time an imperative challenge to manifest our unity. We cannot limit the unity of the Churches to the common *belief* in unity. Such a limitation would mean a docetic conception of the Church and an unreal 'spirituality'. For the Body of Christ

is always simultaneously a visible community of its members in Word, Sacrament and Ministry.

Nor can we comfort ourselves by saying that the multiplicity of our Churches represents the organic wealth of the Body of Christ, according to the Pauline statement about the diversity of the gifts of the Spirit. We have no right to equate this multiplicity with the divided Churches to-day, because the Church as Christ's Body is constituted by communion with the Body of Christ in the Eucharist, and where there is no sacramental communion there is no true organic diversity, but simply disorder and scandal.

Nor may we retreat into our own denominations, because we cannot forget that we have met brethren from the other Churches whom we have recognised as members of the *One Church*.

Thus we have all been led into a crisis through the very fact that we have recognised our unity. But if we do not make effective progress towards reunion, our repeated proclamations of unity will cease to mean anything for Christendom or for the world. If we do not manifest the unity which has been given to us, this act of God's grace will become an accusation. The inspiring vision of unity will itself then place us under the judgment of God.

These sentences are not intended to deny that certain separations between those who call themselves Christians have to take place in obedience to God. In that case the issue is that of the eschatological separation between Church and pseudo-Church, between Christ's reign and the reign of the destructive powers masquerading as Christianity. The issue is then that of eternal life or eternal death. We must, however, deny that *all* of the present divisions among Christians correspond to this last and unavoidable separation.

VII

Let me break off here and return to the beginning of this paper.

The Church is the pilgrim People of God. In this world the Church is on her way towards her Master who is coming again. She does not know what may yet happen to her on the way. Yet she is certain that the Lord is coming to meet her in order to gather together His People who are scattered all over the world, so that they may live united with Him in eternal splendour.

Let us therefore hasten forward along this path, and *not stand still*. We must look *forward*, and not keep our eyes glued to our present situation; we must tear our gaze away from our visible divisions, which we have not yet overcome, and look firmly at the One Lord towards whom we are moving. As we look ahead, in the expectation of the coming Judge of the world and the Redeemer, we shall recognise the temporary character and the lack of finality of many things which now divide us.

Let us hasten forward on our way through the world and not stand still and *not look back*. Let us live on expectation rather than on the habit of clinging to the past. Let us deliberately turn away from the one-sidedness of our conceptions of those historical events in which the division of the Church once took place, a one-sidedness which has often become so rigid. Let us look at the much deeper separation which the returning Lord will effect in all Churches, and at the unity in eternal glory which He will then inaugurate. In this 'forward' look the past will be seen in a new light, and many problems which still seem insoluble will be solved.

Let us hasten forward. Only in the expectation of the Second Coming will we understand the biblical testimonies concerning the first Coming of our Lord. For the whole of the New Testament message points ahead, and it is only as we hasten forward that we shall understand it rightly. Only in the expectation of the Lord who is coming again will we be united with the Lord who once came in the flesh. For the Crucified Lord who comes again is knocking at the door of the house which we have built for ourselves, where we hide from God and the brethren, where we have barricaded ourselves. He says: 'Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me' (Rev. 3.20).

IMPLICATIONS OF THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT BY O. S. TOMKINS

(*Secretary of the Conference*)

When I knew that I was to speak to you, I resolved to find some opportunity to get right away from all the detailed administration involved in this Conference and to see it, as far as I could, as a

whole and in its relation to the ecumenical movement as I understand it. The result I here lay before you; it is in some sort a thank-offering for all that God has given to me through you. For to be involved in the practical side of gathering a conference like this is to find oneself involved, largely unconsciously, in something which challenges long-accepted assumptions, and at the same time reveals new assumptions of which one only slowly becomes aware. Dr. Schlink and I could compare papers only after each of us had completed his own. But we have thought it better not to eliminate from either such points as we were separately led to include in what we wished to say.

I was present at the Edinburgh Conference as a member of the Youth Group, and at that time a worker in the Student Christian Movement; then came some years of work in local church life as a parish priest before I came back as a 'professional' in this ecumenical field, in time to take part in the preparations for Amsterdam and to have a share in all that has followed from it. Soon I expect to be working, still for the ecumenical cause, from within my own particular Church, as a trainer and teacher of young men who are preparing for the ministry in the Church of England. I mention this personal history because it illustrates something which, in varying degrees, is common to us all here—an alternating rhythm, moving between the pre-occupations and loyalties of life in a particular church tradition with its local embodiment, and participation, however infrequent, in a Christian fellowship which is wider than either our own church tradition or our local responsibilities.

Certainly, none of us would make a complete divorce between these two experiences; more or less obscurely we understand that they belong together in a single life in Christ. Certainly it is He who holds them together, and it is in Him that each of them separately has its Author and its goal. But it is idle to pretend that those two modes of the Christian life are not in some ways far apart. I do not know whether most of us will find the greater difficulty in explaining, to those from other backgrounds whom we shall meet here, the nature of our own proper convictions and actions, or in explaining to those who await us when we get home the things that we learnt from each other when we were here!

Of course, there is in all this a great deal that is common to any experience of foreign travel and exchange—the sheer human

difficulty involved in explaining a barbecue or a chicken-fry to those raised on *smörgåsbord* or *bouillabaisse*. But it goes far deeper than that, down to the heart of one of the paradoxes upon which the ecumenical movement is based. We all believe that the Church, which is the Body and Bride of Christ, is something more than our own particular church tradition, and yet we all know that we can only *live* daily in the Body of Christ by living faithfully in our own Churches. The *status* of the World Council lies in accepting that paradox; its *dynamic* lies in refusing to accept it as final. The belief that enables the ecumenical movement to move lies in the unexplored territory of the sense in which the Body of Christ is more than our own Church and of the meaning of living *faithfully* within our own Churches. Of course, that territory is not wholly unexplored. The history of the modern ecumenical movement is the story of patient and fruitful exchange between us of that which we have inherited in our own traditions, of that which others have inherited in theirs, and of the relation of both to that which God has given to us all in Christ. But what I would suggest is that this voyage of exploration, this story of mutual exchange, has brought us, since Edinburgh 1937 and Amsterdam 1948, to a point at which new decisions have to be faced and taken at Lund in 1952.

Since 1948, Faith and Order has been an integral part of the World Council of Churches. To put the ecumenical paradox more clearly and more brutally, the World Council of Churches is a Council of Denominations, whilst its very creation has destroyed the justification of denominations. What are these units of which the World Council is composed? In the latest membership list we enumerate 158 of them; from Britain there are 15 such units represented at this conference; from the U.S.A., 23; from Sweden, 3; from India, 7; and so the list might go on.

We all realise that very diverse histories lie behind these statistics. On one side there are what might be called 'culturally dominant Churches', where one tradition has had for centuries a virtual monopoly of the Christian allegiance of the population, as in this country, Sweden, or in Greece. Theologically, such traditions vary widely, but to-day they are nowhere unchallenged in their monopoly. At the other extreme there are Churches which, culturally and legally, live in what we might call 'multiple parity', no one Church big enough to be treated as the Church

of the whole community, as in the United States or in the areas of the foreign mission activity of the last hundred years and more. It is part of the declared intention of our conference to take fully seriously the cultural and social factors which have played a part in creating those two types of situation and all the other types in between. And, by the same token, we must be fully aware of the social and cultural factors which have been at work to give the World Council of Churches also its present and particular form. To be so will help us to understand also the varying forms of welcome or suspicion which the World Council evokes in different parts of Christendom.

Without for one moment forgetting these forces which have moulded both our several Churches separately and also the form in which they are associated with each other in the Council, I want here to concentrate for a moment upon the manner in which we understand the relation between our Churches as denominations, their relation to each other in the Council and to the one Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church in which we all profess belief. This is not a new subject. It was carefully analysed and some tentative answers suggested in the document produced by the Toronto meeting of the World Council in 1950, *The Church, the Churches and the World Council of Churches*; the theme is opened up in a less full way in the fifth chapter of our report on *The Church*. Dr. Visser 't Hooft spoke of it yesterday, and some of you will have seen an article in the *Ecumenical Review* for the Spring of this year, in which I sought to open up some other aspects of the question. All this I have no intention of repeating, although I suspect, if the discussion at Toronto is any guide, that there will be many members of this conference who have not yet quite grasped the implications of being in a fellowship in which not all the Churches are prepared to say of other bodies in it that they consider them to be *Churches* in the full and true sense of the word. It is equally embarrassing to have one's own Church treated as though it were not really a Church, and to have to treat bodies which one does not believe to be Churches practically as though they were. But to wish to have it otherwise would be to reduce the Council to an association of bodies (whichever they might be) which are already in virtual agreement. Such an association might serve quite useful purposes, but it would not be the Council into which we have in fact been led. No, this Council

has come to be as it is not primarily because we like each other, or agree together, but because God has called us into it in spite of ourselves. Or, as St. John expresses it, 'Herein is love, not that we loved God but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins'. Only after that prior act by God can we draw the imperative consequence, 'Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another' (I John 4.10-11). It is with the implications of that imperative for the ecumenical movement that we are here concerned, and more particularly for that part of it which is represented by our Faith and Order tradition.

In what follows I do not think that I am saying anything new, for I believe it was all implicit, and in some cases explicit, in our earlier conferences at Lausanne and Edinburgh. Indeed, at that earlier Edinburgh Conference of 1910, Charles Henry Brent and others saw that, because co-operation raised the question of unity, great changes would have to happen to us all if we began seriously to seek unity. But at Amsterdam a new and solemn vow was made, of a more binding and comprehensive character than had ever before been made between separated Christians. Speaking through officially chosen delegates, the *Churches* said, 'We have covenanted together in setting up this World Council of Churches . . . we intend to stay together'. No resolution of the Assembly (as was made clear at the time and repeated in the preamble to the Toronto statement) was binding upon any of the Churches. But all that Amsterdam implied was discussed within the various Churches—sometimes extremely seriously and with grave doubts about accepting the implications. So far as I know, not one of the Churches has subsequently expressed its desire to withdraw from that covenant or to repudiate what its representatives undertook in its name at Amsterdam. The World Council then, by its very existence at the behest of the Churches, commits them to stay together, and to share a wide range of concerns. What affects us here in Faith and Order, as an integral part of the Council, are the implications of 'staying together' in all that concerns the unity of the Church of Jesus Christ. I would offer five implications of our association for you to consider.

I

First, I would suggest, this covenant relationship brings us to the end of what I would call a *mere comparative ecclesiology*. It was an

essential and pioneer task of Faith and Order to enable the Churches simply to explain themselves to one another. As a result of forty years of patient and careful work, there now exists a considerable literature setting forth the distinctive theological convictions of the main Christian traditions on such themes as the nature of Grace, the ministry and sacraments, and culminating now in the volumes on intercommunion, the meaning of public worship, and the nature of the Church. It is difficult to overestimate the value of this literature for the drawing of separated Christians into mutual understanding, but it is very easy to overestimate its success in doing so. I do not think that I have many illusions about the extent to which these volumes are read or, if read, understood. It is still deplorably common to find the most perverse statements about what other Christian bodies believe or practise, and to find them being made by people who certainly ought to know better. So I am *not* suggesting that this work of mutual explanation is no longer necessary. We need a long and sustained effort to make sure that its results reach ever wider and wider circles, and perhaps the time has come when we could produce a more easily readable conspectus of all our past work.

I said that it is difficult to overestimate the value of this literature, assuming that it is read. It is difficult but not impossible, and that for two reasons.

(a) First, we have latterly come to realise more vividly the complexity of the pattern of theological conviction. The report on *The Church* described (in Ch. IV) 'trends in theology' which cut across traditional divisions, and so drew our attention to a severe limitation of this method of setting forth for comparison the corporate convictions of our traditions. I would hazard the guess (which there is not likely to be time at this conference to verify) that there is no single theological issue of major importance on which we could not find theologians in agreement with some theologians from another tradition, and in disagreement with some from their own. The implication is clear. Whatever may be the justification for continuing our present divisions, it does *not* lie in the explanation that our divisions exactly correspond with our theological differences.

(b) But there is a more serious objection to what I have called a 'mere comparative ecclesiology' and it is that, if we seek too much to explain our differences by comparative statement of our beliefs

about the Church, we are tempted by the same process to justify them. Our various 'confessional positions' tend to become embattled ramparts which we are determined to defend rather than confessions of faith under which we march out to witness to a common Lord.

Bearing in mind what I have just said about the great need to continue our *education* of those who have not begun to understand the beliefs of their separated fellow Christians (or often, indeed, their own), I would yet suggest that we who are called by our Churches to work at the heart of this enterprise have reached a limit in what can be profitably done in mutual explanation. The work is there, for us to enter into up to the limits of its validity. But let us not suppose that we shall get any further by simply explaining about bishops or baptism all over again. If we do, we shall be in danger of cataloguing dead issues instead of wrestling with living truth, and of giving the finality of a goal to that which was meant to be the starting-point for fresh understanding.

II

In my second point I would press yet further. By entering into this relationship with each other we have already willed the death of our denominations. That is what I meant by saying earlier that although the World Council is a Council of Denominations, because there are no other units with which it could work, it has already destroyed the justification of our denominations. The essence of denominationalism is to suppose the sufficiency of denominations: the essence of our covenant with each other is to deny that our denominations are enough. The peril of the World Council is that it might encourage the permanency of the units upon which it rests, and it is the peculiar vocation of Faith and Order to bear witness in every part of the Council's life that it has come into being only in order to die as a 'Council of Denominations'.

Such language as this is readily liable to misunderstanding, for it may suggest some kind of World Council mystique which evades, instead of transcending, the realities of our division, or that our 'denominations' have no validity or necessity. We cannot simply 'abolish denominations', for almost all of our knowledge of God has been mediated to us through them, and so far as it

goes that knowledge is for each of us valid and true. Of that I am well aware, so let us immediately consider the true meaning of denominational or confessional loyalty. I can speak only from within my own tradition. *Mutatis mutandis*, each of you, I hope, can apply what I say to himself and to his own.

Father Florovsky has written: 'I have no confessional loyalty. My loyalty is wholly to the *Una Sancta*'. As a member of the Church of England I can echo that sentiment. My Church has no desire to be 'a denomination'. It desires simply to be the Church of God in England. We claim no peculiar doctrines or practices; we desire to take our stand (as the Archbishop of Canterbury has recently said) simply upon the Catholic faith, witnessed to in the Catholic creeds, ministering the Catholic sacraments, and maintaining the Catholic ministry. When others of our fellow-countrymen assert that in our preaching of the Word the Catholic faith is not fully heard, or that in our ministry they do not discern the Catholic ministry, we are hurt and bewildered (unnecessarily, some may feel, in the light of the clarity and the vigour with which they have explained to us their reasons for saying so). Yet our fundamental intention remains firm. We do not wish to insist upon anything as a condition of reunion simply because it is a habit of ours, or is something we have found to work well—that would be sheer impertinence. But we do wish to ensure that whatever Church may come to be in England shall show forth the fullness of the Catholic Church of God.

Would you not all, in your different ways, say the same? And yet—when I was ordained to the priesthood (not simply of the Church of England but of the Church of God) I promised, the Lord being my helper, 'so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, *and as this Church and Realm hath received the same*, according to the commandments of God', and, 'to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to the Word of God'. Therein lies the struggle—if I admit any possibility of discrepancy between what 'the Lord hath commanded' and what 'my Church hath received'; the whole ecumenical conversation is on which doctrines are 'erroneous and strange' because contrary to God's Word. The ecumenical movement is the fellowship of those who have been compelled to admit that there is some kind of discrepancy, of which each may learn by paying serious attention to

those who challenge them in the Name of a common Lord, God's Word in His Son. Even if I believe (as I do) that my own Church has been given the fullness of Catholic truth and life in potentiality (and which of you who bases his church life on Holy Scripture differs in this claim from us or from the Orthodox?)—even so, the disparity between what my Church is in practice, and what God means the Church to be, is already the death-warrant of my Church as a sufficient, un-self-critical denomination.

To many of you this is, I know, platitudinous. That is its peril. It has become a platitude which we can reserve for occasions like this. But is it a *truth* which is to be heard, in season and out of season, as we live within our own Churches, and especially upon those occasions when we gather with those of similar denominational inheritance from other countries, or those occasions (if any) when we meet with those of other denominational inheritance in our own countries? Faith and Order exists not only to explain the denominations to each other but also to remind each other that, as denominations, we must die.

III

The third implication of our now explicit relationship to each other as Churches is that it demands new forms of life in each of our Churches through which to respond to that relationship. I am not, of course, concerned here with the *minutiae* of church organisation, representative government, authority and competence of church 'representatives' and so forth. Such matters vary greatly from Church to Church, but they would all be affected if this point were taken as seriously as I believe it ought to be. Let me put it first in the form of two questions: 'Which is of greater ultimate significance, the unity that we have as Christians by faith in our One Lord, or the differences that we have because of our varying interpretations of His Will?' Put beside your answer to that your answer to this question: 'Which has the bigger place, in terms of time and money spent by living men and women in the organisation of our church life, the things which we do together or the things which we do separately?' I believe that if we took seriously our 'given unity in Christ' it would, in course of time, completely reverse our normal structure of church organisation. The implication of our confessed

unity in Christ, beneath and above our divisions, is that we should do together everything except what irreconcilable difference of sincere conviction compels us to do separately. Our present structure of Christian co-operation is too often based upon the assumption that we do everything we can separately, and only when we have reached the end of our resources there do we act in unity. When we act thus, we are fighting against the deepest truth about our being in Christ.

The implication for 'faith and order' is clear in the words of our Lord that 'he that doeth the will shall know the doctrine'. There are truths about the nature of God and of His Church which will remain to us for ever closed unless we act together in obedience to the unity which is already ours.

There is one aspect of this need for new forms in the life of our Churches which I would especially stress—the relation between the vocations of the Church to unity and to mission. It is a subject which is already under discussion, as those of you will know who have read the document coming from the Rolle Central Committee, and the recent I.M.C. Conference at Willingen has asked us to have it in our thoughts here. John 17.21 has long been regarded as a charter-text of Faith and Order, but I for one have a bad conscience about how far 'that the world may believe' has always been in the fore-front of our conscious work for unity. For example, I wonder in how many cases the church delegations chosen for this conference were deliberately picked to include some who would have a deep insight into the nature and need of unity precisely because they were primarily concerned with the evangelistic mission.

One of the things we share together as Christians is a common incomprehensibility to the mass of mankind. In the whole modern world, the language, thought and traditions of Christianity are growing increasingly meaningless to millions of our contemporaries. This is not the time and place to discuss that problem in all its complexity, but it is right that we should remind ourselves that the work for unity is sterile if it is not at the same time a work of mission, and that not for any merely tactical or pedagogical reasons but because an essential note of the Church, inseparable from its unity, is its apostolicity which, whatever else its meaning, includes that of a Church which is continually *sent* on a mission to the world as the Father sent the Son.

IV

Fourthly, must we not recognise, now, that our continued association in the ecumenical movement has brought us to a new level of responsibility in common prayer? I will not attempt to dwell at any length on matters which properly belong to the Section on Ways of Worship. But as I was able to participate a little in the work of that preparatory commission, and to get to know the mind of that lovable and wayward genius who presided over it up to the time of his death, I felt more and more keenly that here was an aspect of our work which had only really begun, and that Faith and Order had a special obligation to uncover deeper regions of the spirit than could be reached by our traditional methods of theological research and discussion. In worship, to use van der Leeuw's own words, 'decisions have to be taken which are not only doctrinal but existential'. The sense of urgency with which the Theological Commission on Intercommunion did its work, and with which its report and volume have been received, are further evidence that when we touch questions of what we *do* in worship we are engaging with one another at a deeper level of commitment than is usually reached by discussion. Personally, I do not see at all clearly whither the next steps should lead.

Since 1942, by a postal decision of the Executive in war-time, the Faith and Order Commission has sought to make its own kind of contribution during the Week of Prayer of January 18th-25th, and I have received various enquiries from individuals as to whether this conference might advocate to the Churches a more widespread and serious support of this time of common prayer, in which, in many quarters already, not only the traditions represented here but also Roman Catholics join, in supplication 'for the unity of the Church of Christ according to the will of Christ'. But that is a possibility to which we shall have the opportunity of returning later in this conference. Whatever the value and the means of such common prayer, what I would rather stress now is our need to begin in Faith and Order a period of more sustained and adventurous experiment in supplementing our traditional methods with ways of meeting each other at the level of common devotional understanding. The whole project bristles with difficulties, for the reception given to the report and

volume on *Ways of Worship* shows that we are liable to suspicions and misunderstandings here which we have largely overcome in the field of theological discussion, at least at the heart of our movement. The lack of a common language in our devotional traditions, and the way in which theological differences are more keenly felt when they are prayed, are formidable difficulties, but constitute an inescapable challenge to devise ways of meeting each other more truly in that very moment of defencelessness and self-exposure when we are on our knees before our Judge and Saviour.

V

Finally, I would suggest that we must now grasp more firmly the central problem of our relationship. We claim that we have a unity in Christ; we cannot show that we have unity in His Body, the Church. That is the heart of our dilemma, but it is also the ground of our hope. For we must believe, we who have such good reason for knowing it in the deepest places of our experience as Christians, that we are right in that first affirmation. The whole tradition of our movement affirms it, the messages of Lausanne and Edinburgh proclaimed it; the report on the Church at Amsterdam praised and thanked God 'for a mighty work of His Holy Spirit, by which we have been drawn together to discover that, notwithstanding our divisions, we are one in Jesus Christ'. Successive generations, entering into the means of grace which this ecumenical fellowship affords, humbly and wonderingly re-affirm the same. Yet it cannot be allowed to rest there, for we say either too little or too much. Nothing in the biblical conception of the Church, nor in the lives of the primitive Christians, will allow us to affirm for ever that we have unity in Christ and deny that we have unity in the Church. We must face this together now as a *common* problem, allowing each other no escape from the rigorous demands of accepting the Lordship of Christ. Certainly, by the time this conference ends, we may hope that God will have shown us the lines along which our work should continue. The last chapter of the report on *The Church* contains three fruitful suggestions in the field of biblical studies: the nature and work of the Holy Spirit, eschatology, and the various manifestations of the *Kerygma*. To those I would add—though it touches upon them all—a renewed common study of

christology, for surely it is chiefly in a deeper common understanding of the central mysteries of the Person and work of Christ that we shall get more light upon the derived and complementary mysteries of the nature of His Body and Bride, the Church.

We must not exaggerate the part that can be played by Faith and Order. Our movement is only a tiny fraction of the continuous and largely hidden work of unification which is being carried out by Him in whom all things are to be summed up. In every earnest prayer for the unity of the Body, in all honest theological study and in every act of Christian love and reconciliation, His unifying work goes forward. Although the Roman Catholic Church does not co-operate formally in our work, the manifest concern of Roman Catholics, both clergy and laity, has never been absent from my thoughts in everything that I have said. But here we are primarily concerned with our own conference, and the specific responsibilities which it represents.

In the goodness of God we are met together for the third time as a World Conference on Faith and Order. We have much for which to praise God in the labours of our forefathers, and now we enter into their labours. I have tried to suggest some of the implications which face us to-day through all that has been given to us in the past. God has led us as Churches into a new degree of conscious dependence upon each other, as we grow more aware of our common dependence upon Him. It is not for us to demand to know the nature or the time of the results of our work; it is enough that in heaven, where the Father's Name is honoured and His Will done, union is already effected through Christ our Lord, and that the Church prays daily for that which is done in heaven to be done on earth. We need have no fear that God has not prepared for us, as we meet in His Name, new paths for us to walk in. We need only to pray for His grace to discern His ways and for courage to walk in them.

CHAPTER 5

THE SOCIAL AND CULTURAL FACTORS IN CHURCH DIVISIONS



Part of the preparation for the Lund Conference had been an increasing conviction that the divisions between Christians cannot be attributed to theological causes alone. This was no new conviction in the Faith and Order movement. Prior to the Edinburgh Conference in 1937, a report was prepared by a group in America entitled 'The Non-theological Factors in the Making and Unmaking of Church Union'. When the Faith and Order Commission met at Chichester in 1949, the Secretary presented to it a letter which he had received from Professor C. H. Dodd of Cambridge concerning 'unavowed motives in ecumenical discussions'. It evoked a lively interest, and resulted in the Commission's deciding that, although it was too late to make this subject the material for a separate theological commission, it should continue to be borne in mind in the preparations for the Lund Conference. Subsequently the American Committee for Faith and Order began some correspondence on the subject, and finally convened a study conference in the summer of 1951. The fruit of their work was brought by three of their number to another conference, primarily of European and British church members, which was held at the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, Switzerland, in November 1951. This conference, which consisted not so much of professional theologians (though they were included in its number) as of historians, economists, psychologists, etc., produced a report which was published in Faith and Order Commission Paper No. 10, together with Professor Dodd's letter and two papers read at the Bossey Conference, by Dr. G. R. Cragg (Canada) and Professor Jacques Ellul (France). This material had been sent to all delegates prior to the Lund Conference.

At a full session at 10 a.m. on Monday, August 18th, the conference had an opportunity to hear three previously prepared papers on 'Social and Cultural Factors in our Divisions', followed by two shorter statements by delegates. The substance of these contributions is given as follows:

FIRST PAPER, BY DR. HARMANNUS OBENDIEK¹

(translated from the German)

Our theme was already touched on at the Edinburgh Conference in 1937. All the members of the Conference at Bossey in November 1951 became aware of its urgency. It was decided to draw the attention of all participants at Lund and all Churches represented there to this urgency. Every individual Church must face this problem in the light of her past history and her present situation, and not simply leave it to the consideration of a few experts.

We can be guided by four points:

I. We speak of cultural and social factors because the Church, as the Church of Christ in the world, has its existence and its calling in this world with its cultural and social factors.

II. The Church in the world is a complex body, and we therefore cannot avoid the difficulties which our theme presents.

III. The viewpoints there put forward seek to call the Churches out of the self-confidence of their individual existence.

IV. Our enquiry concerns the tasks to which, in the light of a critical consideration of our history, we are called in the present.

I

Perennial themes of discussion involving these social and cultural factors (questions such as 'Theology and Philosophy', 'Christian Faith and Reason', 'Missions and Colonisation') must no longer be treated in a purely historical or academic way. The Church has no static pattern which can be studied objectively from without; anyone who speaks of the Church of Jesus Christ and then examines the division of the Church is himself challenged and questioned about his own faith and behaviour.

We must guard against falsely objectifying these factors, since it is not to them but to Jesus Christ that ultimate power belongs.

In this light we shall avoid the danger of speaking of the

¹ Sections I and II of Dr. Obendiek's address have been abbreviated considerably to allow space for Sections III and IV to be printed in full as delivered.—*Ed.*

Church in sociological terms, as a mere human society whose development is hindered by certain factors.

These factors may in themselves be neutral, and yet we have to ask what power they serve and what spirit governs them, for in these respects they cannot be neutral towards Jesus Christ.

In the conflict between Christ and the powers of this world, the Churches must use these factors in the service of Christ, not to assure their own life.

Worldly powers—money, or the State—although ordained by God, may assume control of all social and cultural factors, of which the Church, if it has been insufficiently faithful, may be regarded as one.

We are not trying to develop a philosophy of power in order to advocate a dynamic or even magical world view. A divided Church set amidst these powers can never be complacent or neutral. But in the light of Christ's victory social and cultural factors fall into their proper perspective, to be used by the Church in so far as the cause of Christ can thereby be furthered.

In the obedience of faith, all forms of ecclesiastical idealism must be rejected. The Church cannot be protected against all non-ecclesiastical factors: as it is in the world, so it must find right decisions about how to use them in our Lord's service.

We cannot rest content with a static position. To-day it is precisely social and cultural factors which are pressing the Church forwards. It is in this spirit that we must receive the report of the Bossey Conference, and ask the question: 'What can *we* do?'

We ask this question in all confidence, even though our knowledge is only fragmentary and we can only advance step by step. We believe in the unity of the Church because it was the will of her Head. Jesus Christ as Head of the Church is Lord of the world including the social and cultural factors. In this faith we dare to enquire together and to seek for the right way for negotiations. The day will come when cultural and social factors will no longer preoccupy us and when it will become plain that they too could not prevent the creation of one flock under one Shepherd. Yes, they too must serve to this end and His Lordship.

II

In spite of all difficulties, let us not shirk them.

Even our definitions of these factors differ; but however hard it may be to track them down, perhaps we may limit our discussion to those factors which operate in the Church other than the purely theological ones.

Yet the Church exists in the world, and theology concerns the relationship of God and man, and cannot be regarded as an abstract doctrinal system. For this reason we are bound to enquire how far the non-theological factors are themselves theologically conditioned.

Churches generally seek theological justification for their actions, and this may on occasion amount to self-deception, even if practised in good faith. Our present theological vocabulary cannot be relied upon to provide the real motives for our decisions.

The factors themselves can change. What in the past was a confession of faith may to-day have become simply one ideology among others. We cannot be content to repeat that we have Abraham for our father.

Under persecution a Church may be driven back to her theological foundations, but even here social and cultural factors will make their weight felt in the scales of decision. No Church depends entirely upon theology.

Theological and non-theological factors, sacred and secular history, are continually interacting.

No factors have independent validity. 'For by him all things were created' (Col. 1.16). Yet makers of revolutions usually regard the Church as a mere collection of social and cultural factors, and this must serve as a warning to us to examine whether we are really seeking the things that are above.

The effect of social and cultural factors varies in different Churches, but this variety of impact may at least prevent us from jumping to conclusions without practical significance.

In our common work certain factors emerge which concern us all; but these new insights demand a common dedication, and we must ask whether the Churches are prepared for this consequence, or whether their understanding will remain purely theoretical.

III

The work which has been done up to the present has clarified a number of matters we have learnt together and from each other.

The work of our American friends deserves consideration: none of the Churches can ignore what they have taught us about the fear of sectarian isolationism, about the arts and sciences, about past and present history, national and racial discrimination, language and class divisions and the influence of custom. The effect of financial considerations has also been brought to our notice. All these factors are in one way or another relevant to our Churches, and each must examine for itself the relevance of each. We remember Dr. Dodd's rousing letter as well as the contributions to the Bossey Conference and its report. All these may well add up to a useful list of social and cultural factors. Arising from the preparatory work, I should like to draw your attention to the following points.

What is the meaning of conservatism in relation to the Churches? It may well be that it is only a reversal of the fact that the Church is called upon to preach an unchanging gospel. In a world which is governed by changing and transitory factors this tends to produce a conservative frame of mind which, although not in itself theological, is all the more devastating because there is some theological justification for it. The unchanging gospel of Jesus Christ impels us forwards, because it points to the dawning day. But the Church tends to be content with a co-operation with powers that live in the past rather than the present. In this way conservatism becomes a factor in the Church's life which threatens not only her message but also her existence.

We see a similar factor in nationalism. The regional organisation of a Church may be of very practical use in view of her mission. It is however quite another thing for a Church to organise itself within a nation or a people. Here the question raised is: Is it a Church of the people or a Church for the people, is it an ethnic cultural institution or the Church of Jesus Christ with a mission in relation to the people? Conditions in Germany illustrate this problem. The German Evangelical Church after the war became the Evangelical Church in Germany, and this change denotes one of the gains made during the church struggle. The problem is always posed from both sides, however. The state, or the people,

tend to seize on everything within their sphere of influence in order to use it for their ends, and there is no need for this to be laid down in any party programme. The Church, on the other hand, only too easily succumbs to the temptation of becoming herself a vehicle for ecclesiastical power politics, and thus becomes the religious arm of the nation's cultural life. She has on occasion even been prepared to adopt the idea of a national or state religion, and has been rewarded for this with privileges and financial gains. At present the separation between state and Church is the rule, but totalitarian systems have nationalised the Churches.

The social background of their members does not only affect the character of those Churches which have been established by the voluntary decision of their members. The question also arises in relation to the social stratification of national and state Churches. Thus these established Churches are by no means defined only by their creeds and their orders of worship, but also by social factors. This is relevant to their relationship with other Churches. We must remember such matters as finance, language, political and cultural development. At the present time ever larger political and economic *blocs* are developing. Will the Churches for their part remain in their old divisions, or will they be affected by these larger groupings? What is the effect of cultural and political expansion on the Churches? Will they be pressed into service as propagandists, or will they regard such expansion as a means of preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ to new groups of people? And what about the purity of their motives?

Confessional changes are by no means always rooted in theological transformations, nor do they always spring from a concern for truth. We tend to think that the Reformation of the sixteenth century was theologically determined, but this only raises a weighty problem in so far as the Reformation was largely confined to the cultural orbit of the German-Scandinavian-Anglo-Saxon areas. Again, the watchword of the Reformation was: 'The Word shall conquer, the Word alone'—but why then was so much force needed to introduce the motto, and why did its maintenance need to be ensured by law? Were the Churches of the Reformation led to their theological conclusions in the years that followed, or was their whole history, their life and

worship, determined by non-theological factors from the very beginning?

In a preparatory paper for the Bossey Conference, Brother George Every presented a thesis which must be regarded as both stimulating and alarming, if it can be seriously substantiated. Brother George postulated that the theological differences in the replies which the different Churches made to the problem put to them by the Arians were caused by their widely differing spiritual and social situations. This thesis illustrates both sides of the problem. The theological differences themselves are traced back to differing spiritual and social situations, but this means that the theological differences are divested of their theological character by research into their origins. Nevertheless, the differences look theological, and have been evaluated as such by the Church until the present day. Are we to say that they are really in no way theologically determined? And are we to say that social and cultural factors were decisive?

This proves that we are not concerned with theological marginalia. Is not the question: 'What think ye of Christ?' If then the Bossey thesis stands unchallenged, the ground is cut away from under our feet. We have to ask: What is truth? And then we realise that our undertaking is of a different nature than a statistical investigation. The subject becomes definitely theological in so far as it concerns the truth. If it is true that the great schism between East and West in 1054 was 'in the first place determined by cultural differences between East and West' (K. D. Schmidt), what about the theological cause that is always put forward, and how did it come about that a culturally determined difference later saw heresy as the ground of schism? Are we led back to the conclusion that theology itself is partially determined by social and cultural factors? If so, what does this mean? Along this line our questions outnumber our answers. In any case, it does indicate that we cannot regard our various confessions as strongholds within which we can feel safe from all assaults. We can regard ourselves as warned not to rely on our creeds rather than on Jesus Christ Himself. If our common work produces this view of the situation, and this warning, it will not be in vain.

IV

Turning now to our task, I must draw attention in the first instance to the report of the Bossey Conference. The question of action was discussed, and we must note the recommendations. At their end we are reminded that we should not forget to pray, both during our Conference here and afterwards. Let us therefore ask the Lord to 'open our eyes to the true and definite symptoms of our sickness'.

In detail, the following may be useful in order to prevent us from embarking on ecclesiology without christology, so that we may not spend days in discussing the Church and forget about our Lord Jesus Christ.

We should endeavour to recognise the time of the visitation of our Lord. Those countries which call themselves Christian are affected by a serious crisis. Other countries are seeking ways in which they can form their social and cultural lives effectively. Therefore we must both together concern ourselves seriously with history, at whose central point the saving task of Jesus Christ was performed.

At such a period of history, we are thrown back on the basic questions. This is evident from the trends of present day philosophy which concern the nature of human life. But the question addressed to the Churches is that about the power of the gospel. Our subject does not concern some objective fact, but the answer to the plain and urgent question: Shall we make ourselves at home in our church buildings with the aid of outdated social and cultural factors, or are we prepared for that service which by the command and in the name of Christ we owe the world?

Denominational divisions all too easily lead to Pharisaism, and our quest for the social and cultural factors in these divisions may help us to diminish our pride, to be less self-righteous about our own denominations, to take the wholeness of the Church into our consciousness and thereby to ask and to note which gift Christ as Head of the Church has entrusted to those with whom we do not regard ourselves as being—as we think—theologically at one.

On no account should we allow our work to lead us to accuse one another's denominations of having been influenced more by social and cultural factors than by our Lord. If our investigations

are carried out properly, none of us will be able to claim purity of theological motive for our tradition (I Cor. 11.31,32). We shall remember moreover that the Lord Himself is our Judge (Isa. 33.22).

We shall not be concerned to remove the Church from the world or to guard it from the influence of social and cultural factors. Such arguments would lead us to cut the Church off from the world altogether. God's will in sending His Son is, on the other hand, not a negation of the world, but its affirmation, and we shall have to examine whether the influence of social and cultural factors in the past hinders us at present in our proper witness to Jesus Christ in word and deed.

In pursuing the social and cultural factors in accordance with our mandate, we shall be spared one illusion and a disappointment. Our work at least will preserve us from the expectation that 'the ideal of a united Church is a tangible possibility to whose realisation in the not too distant future we may look forward' (Archbishop Brilioth's speech at Amsterdam about the position before Lausanne). We are not called to an ideal but to the witness of the forgiving and renewing grace of God which has appeared to us in Jesus Christ. This witness means service, if necessary to the extent of sacrifice. Unity in service and in sacrifice is more legitimate than the attempt to construct unity by compromise.

We do not forget or ignore the fact that the Faith and Order movement stems from the International Missionary Conference at Edinburgh. It was Charles Brent the missionary who there had the vision of Christian unity. In pursuing the significance of social and cultural factors for the division of the Church on account of her missionary task we are therefore true to the original intentions of the movement. We follow the ways of our fathers and are obedient to the call of our Lord to go and preach the gospel to all creatures.

Our concern with social and cultural factors can furthermore lead us to a reading of Holy Scripture in freedom and confidence, because it is no longer required as a proof text for the orthodoxy of our denominations. If the way of the Church in this world is worldly and temporal as the influence of the social and cultural factors may indicate, we can no longer insist on an essential sanctity. All the more we are called to the expectation of the voice of the living Lord which speaks to us in the biblical witness

of Jesus Christ. In this expectation we work and pray for the Holy Spirit.

Our direction is what matters. Are we striving from a multiplicity which a study of the social and cultural factors emphasises, to unity? Or do we straight away see our diversity in the light of our unity? In that case our unity would be our proper and common starting point, and would be victorious, not in a false enthusiasm but in the victory of faith. Our unity is given by our one Lord, although not in its perfect state, but by the presence of our Lord with us. From Him our work receives its import, its freedom and its promise.

The social and cultural factors will raise questions of past and modern history, but we shall not let ourselves be led by this to a this-worldly view of history. We shall also have to take account of the work done in sociology, psychology and the social sciences, but in all this we shall not forget that all history, and its changing factors, has a central point—the mission and the work of our Lord—nor that history has one Lord and is for this reason a sphere different from the social, cultural and other spheres which are highly charged with tensions. We shall also remember that history has a goal, the second coming of Jesus Christ, the day of His appearance in glory. We know that we and all our Churches, and all the factors which we shall study, are taken up into this history and attempt to direct it, only too often in directions away from our Lord Jesus Christ. In this way taken up and inescapably involved in history, we pray:

‘Thy kingdom come. That means: govern us by Thy Word and Spirit so that we may subject ourselves increasingly to Thee; maintain and increase Thy Church and destroy the works of the devil and all powers which rise against Thee and all evil counsels which are devised against Thy holy Word until the fulness of Thy Kingdom come in which Thou wilt be all in all’ (Heidelberg Catechism, question 123).

SECOND PAPER, BY DR. WINFRED E. GARRISON

Students of religion have long known that culture, social structure and habits, climate, economic conditions, forms of government, national loyalties and the like affect all religions except their own.

I heartily concur in the general appreciation of the service rendered by Professor Dodd in bringing to the attention of the conference the fact that these non-theological influences upon ecclesiastical attitudes are pertinent to the field of our inquiry. But I am surprised at the novelty that seems to be ascribed to the discovery, not merely of the importance of considering these influences, but even of their very existence. Surely it requires no argument to prove that social, cultural and political conditions have left their mark on the patterns of religious thought and behaviour.

I have seldom conversed at any length with any British or Continental European theologian who did not indicate sooner or later that he recognised a definite quality of 'Americanism' in the religious thought and practice of my compatriots—a quality obviously derived from the social fluidity, the cultural immaturity, the impatience of restraint, the individualistic concept of liberty, the zest for action, growth and material gain, all of which are seen as characteristics of what is, relatively, a frontier situation. Similarly, it is not to be denied that in America one may hear it said, from time to time, that European Christianity exhibits traits imposed upon it or instilled into it by the accidents of a long and turbulent secular history, and that it gives solemn theological and ecclesiastical sanction to ways of thinking and acting which in fact register reactions to social and political situations. It is scarcely possible that both of those can be false. One or the other or both of them may be true.

One chief purpose of giving attention to cultural and social (or 'non-theological') factors is to induce each one of us to scrutinise critically his own position—and especially those aspects of it which are obstacles to unity—with a view to discovering whether there are elements in it which owe their support largely, or chiefly, or even solely, to these secular considerations which, in their very nature, are fortuitous, contingent, temporal (not to say temporary) and local. I may say that historical circumstances of this kind may be temporal and temporary even though they have existed for a long time, and may be local even though their locus may be impressive in geographical extent.

While the test of intellectual honesty in such research is one's willingness to subject one's own position to this kind of examination, each is also under obligation to apply the same method to

the consideration of the positions of groups other than his own. It is not easy to do this without prejudice, for every man who views a landscape must view it from where he stands. The presupposition of this study is that where each man stands is partly defined by these things which constitute his social heritage and go far toward making him the kind of man he is. When the landscape to be viewed is that of religion, the observer's standpoint is determined by theological convictions, personal experience, relationship to a particular group, *and* this complex of cultural and social factors which are the special subject of our present inquiry. He cannot shift his standpoint arbitrarily, or even by a generous act of determination to be completely objective. But if we cannot escape from the limitations of our respective points of view—and I doubt whether any of us really wants to, for we are here as men of conviction and commitment, not as disinterested spectators of the battle—we can at least recognise them and make allowance for them.

I shall doubtless go on to the end being a white American, with a firm attachment to the concept of a great deal of individual liberty in economics, industry, government and religion, an unwavering devotion to the Free Church principles of voluntarism and the separation of Church and State, a certain suspicion of intricate ecclesiastical systems which seem to me to be constructed according to feudal and monarchical patterns that not only are outmoded now but never were relevant to the Christian gospel, and a strong belief that the struggle for any high degree of doctrinal agreement among free minds as a condition of unity is both futile and unnecessary. From this standpoint, which I am not likely to abandon and which I know a good many other Christians will not abandon, I must do my honest best to view the standpoints that are different from mine and try to see how the situation looks to those who occupy these points of view.

To make this inquiry into cultural and social factors profitable, one other principle must be kept in mind. The fact that a given doctrinal belief or church practice may seem to be correlated with a particular social or cultural fact does not prove that it is wrong. It may have other and entirely adequate grounds, and the correlation may be incidental. It would be disastrous if our explorations in this field should turn out to be a general undermining of Christian beliefs and practices whether our own or others, on the

theory that, since they are all found to have some correlation with secular affairs and to bear the imprint of cultural and social conditions, therefore none of them has any authority that is valid for Christians generally. For illustration I will cite one thing which I have no personal interest whatever in defending. In seventeenth-century England, when both Church and State were in a condition of structural instability, it was declared that episcopacy and monarchy were indispensable to each other. 'No bishop, no king' became a slogan by which to woo loyal monarchists to the support of the episcopal rather than the presbyterian system of polity. I suppose no one will deny that throughout a great part of the history of Christianity the episcopal structure of the Church has had a certain analogy—to put it no stronger—with the structure of civil government. I cite this only to say that, assuming it to be true, it does not prove that episcopacy has no other or no more substantial foundation.

We need to recognise the social and cultural influences which have helped to determine our own positions, as well as those of others, but we also need to guard against being intimidated or unduly embarrassed by the recognition of these facts.

Passing over such important questions as those of episcopacy and independency and of the nature of the Church's continuity, on both of which it may be argued that social and political influences have not been without some effect, I wish to direct attention to two other areas in which these factors are even more manifestly influential. The first of these has to do with the contrast between the state-church system and the free-church system. The second concerns the degree of theological agreement that is to be considered essential in a united Church and, more particularly, the means by which the degree of theological agreement deemed necessary to a Church's integrity has hitherto been sought.

The difference between the state-church system and the free-church system is one which it would be unfraternal and un-Christian for us to regard as a permanent and unbridgeable chasm, but it is one which it is folly to ignore. It is a delicate topic, not easy to discuss without the danger of giving offence, even when one's intention is most irenic. It is, however, a real obstacle to unity, and it must therefore be faced. This seems a good place to face it, for certainly here, if anywhere, social and cultural forces have had great influence in determining the developments. The

distinction to which attention is now being called represents a cleavage quite different from that between Churches having authoritative unifying structures—episcopal, presbyterial or synodical—and those which cherish the autonomy of the local congregation. Churches with any of these polities may be ‘free Churches’, as indeed all of them are in the United States or in any other country having no establishment.

We are concerned for the moment with the contrast between (a) those Churches which regard themselves as, ideally at least, co-extensive with the entire community and which employ some measure of connection with the civil government as a means of realising this claim, and (b) those which consider that the membership of the Church should consist of persons who have made some personal and voluntary commitment to Christ and His cause. This difference involves widely variant conceptions of the nature of the Church.

The first of these views is exhibited with complete clarity and fine scholarship in the volume representing the Swedish Lutheran position, recently published in English under the title *This is the Church*, edited by Bishop Nygren, which is a translation of the greater part of an outstanding work issued in Swedish in 1945. This symposium by some of the ablest minds in the Church of Sweden makes it clear that that Church views establishment as a state Church and the inclusion of practically the entire population of a country within the membership of the Church, regardless of personal faith, repentance or commitment, as perfectly in harmony with the New Testament concept of the Church and with a sound theology of the Church.

Speaking for myself, I cannot refrain from saying how shocking such an idea seems to me. Speaking for the Free Churches generally, I can only say that, by and large, they reject this conception *in toto*. It would be out of place in this session even to raise the question as to which concept of the Church is exegetically and theologically right, and it is not mentioned in order to disparage either view or any Church. It is, however, pertinent to raise the question as to what social and cultural factors have played some part—I will not say necessarily the decisive part, though it may have been that—in bringing both groups to these widely different positions, the disharmony between which is one of the serious impediments to union.

Let me begin by scrutinising the free-church position, which I myself hold. This position implies that membership in the Church is conditioned upon a voluntary act of commitment to Christ. Of course that does not mean that the Church came into existence through man's will or man's act, but that membership in it is voluntary. The belief that the Church ought to be so constituted and the actual existence of a Church so constituted imply the claim that every man ought to have the legal and civil right to make the decision involved in such a choice and to act upon it freely—that is to say, the right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience and, in doing so, to be exempt not only from actual legal compulsions or restraints amounting to persecution, but also from social, political or economic disadvantages imposed upon him by the State, or by a dominant Church backed by the State, as a consequence of his faith. This obviously involves a concept of the character of the State and of the rights of man as well as an idea of the nature of the Church.

The history of modern times seems to make it indisputable that the idea of such rights was kindled in the minds of men far more by the development of concepts of civil and political liberty through the work of secular thinkers, statesmen, social agitators and political theorists than by biblical and theological research.

One very influential voice, which may be mentioned only as an illustration, was that of John Locke, who was at once a philosopher and a social and political theorist. It was in these capacities that he made his great contribution to the cause of individual liberty. He was a Christian to be sure, but certainly no professional exegete, theologian or church administrator. It is well for democratic free churchmen to remember that John Locke—fountain of the philosophy of freedom as he was—was himself a loyal monarchist and a member of the established Church of England.

Before and after and around the thinkers and theorists of civil liberty there was a great and growing wave of less articulate popular demand for freedom. Through all these influences, which may be called 'secular'—using the term without opprobium—but which were certainly 'non-theological', some millions of men came to be aware of civil rights not previously or generally recognised. It was natural for some of them to discover that these

rights were as applicable in the field of religion as in any other—that if they had the general civil rights to think, speak, print, persuade and organise for the promotion of their ideas, they could do all these things in the practice and propagation of their faith. That meant religious liberty. It also meant free Churches.

The Netherlands, England and America furnished the most fertile fields for this development and the most conspicuous examples of it. It was carried farther in America than elsewhere because the political instruments of restraint and compulsion were relatively ineffective, the sociological and geographical incitements to the independence of the individual were greatest and the importation of all the European varieties of religion made them all minorities in the new country. This came to be true in the individual colonies before the winning of American political independence, so that the system of Establishment in the nine colonies that had established Churches was already fading out, and national establishment of any one Church was a political impossibility, even if anybody had wanted it.

The free-church system, however, was not an American invention and is not now to be brushed off as an American idiosyncrasy. It had roots in Holland and in England. Moreover, it had deeper roots than that. All that John Locke said about religious liberty in his celebrated *Letters Concerning Toleration* had already been said, in substance, by Tertullian early in the third century and by Lactantius either at the end of that century or in the earliest years of the fourth century. Back of that, it will not be denied that the Church of the first century was a 'free Church' in the sense that nobody was in it who did not want to be. Its human components were convinced and committed persons who had voluntarily entered its fellowship and who claimed the individual right to choose a religious association in accordance with their faith—even in an age when theories of individual rights were undeveloped and when a pagan government was doing what it could to compel all its subjects to unite in giving it religious sanction.

Whether this early state of the Church was, in the design of God, only temporary and whether it was His eternal purpose that the Church should take over instruments of compulsion as soon as it was strong enough to wield them, are questions beyond the scope of this inquiry. At present I am merely saying that the modern exponents of religious liberty and a free Church did not

invent these ideas. They were there ready to be discovered in history when modern social and political thought brought them to mind and when social, political, and cultural conditions made their realisation possible.

The 'denominational system' may more plausibly be called an American invention. If it is, it is not one to be proud of. Actually, it is not an invention at all but an inevitable consequence of the co-existence of two old factors with one new one. The old factors were: the natural tendency of men's minds to develop diverse views, and the refusal of each Church to give more than very limited scope for a diversity of views within its own communion. The new factor was the absence of any action by the State to enforce conformity, penalise dissent or prevent organisation for the maintenance and promotion of variant views of religion. This new factor, freedom, was in the main a secular product, though not wholly so. The free-church system, then, culminating in extreme and divisive denominationalism as we know it at its worst in America, was deeply affected by non-theological factors. What about the state-church system against which the free-church system arose in protest? What social and political factors entered into its formation and development? That is, of course, a much longer and more intricate story. Essentially, it began in the fourth century—not with the Edict of Toleration, when the Church ceased to be a persecuted Church, but later in that century when the Church became a persecuting Church. Within that century there arose the view that religious solidarity was essential to the stability of the State and the cohesion of the social order, and that it was the duty of the State and Church in co-operation to use whatever means of compulsion might be convenient and effective to that end. Paganism and heresy alike were to be eradicated, by the sword if necessary, and the membership of the Church was to be made co-extensive with the total population of the civil community. Churchmen then were glad to remember that the religion of Israel had been a compulsory religion for all Israelites, and to quote verses from Deuteronomy commanding the slaughter even of spouses or children who departed from the faith.

Whether the Church or the State initiated this programme of compulsory conformity is a moot question, but one that is not of primary importance. Both adopted it, not on theological, but on pragmatic grounds. This social and political philosophy, which

viewed the inclusion of the whole of society in one religious structure as essential both for the safety of the State and for the honour of the Church, dominated Europe for more than a thousand years. It carried through the Reformation and into the great Protestant national Churches. Persecution ceased with the rise and growth of civil rights. Not only were the instruments of compulsion laid aside but the spirit of compulsion was superseded by the spirit of liberty. But the state-church system, which must now be explained and defended on other grounds, still exhibits the pattern fixed upon it by the social and political forces under the impact of which it was created, just as truly as the free-church system exhibits the secular concepts of liberty. Those who adhere to these two contrasting systems, and find biblical and theological sanction for them, cannot hope to find common ground unless they are willing to recognise the complex and partly secular background of both.

There is no time to do much more than mention the other area to which reference has been made—namely, that which concerns the degree of theological agreement that is essential to a united Church and the means by which it has been attained, in so far as it has been attained. It would perhaps be fanciful to ascribe to secular influences any decisive part in orienting the mind of the Church toward doctrinal agreement as a necessary criterion, though even that might be a subject for profitable study. Some of the great creeds were formulated for the explicit purpose of excluding heretics, and the motives for desiring to exclude those particular heretics might be found to show a mingling of theological and non-theological factors. The unmistakable and determining influence of secular forces, however, is seen in the procedures by which unanimous consent has been obtained for those doctrinal formulations. Throughout the greater part of the Church's history the gaining of general acceptance for such formulations was not accomplished without the use of violence or the threat of violence for the suppression of dissenting opinions.

I wish to quote one paragraph from the report of a small conference on the 'non-theological factors' held at the Château de Bossey in November 1951:

'Some look back with longing to a past when a very high degree of unity appeared to exist within the Church. A closer

examination, however, reveals the unpleasant fact that in the attainment of this unity coercion or persecution played a lesser or a greater part. Sometimes the Church was supported by the strong arm of the State in enforcing unity; sometimes it applied physical or spiritual coercion itself; sometimes the State applied the coercion in its own interests. This fact carries with it far-reaching implications for the type of unity which can be reached under conditions of civil liberty. No one participating in ecumenical discussions would defend the use of any form of coercion in attaining unity to-day, because unity must grow out of the message of Jesus Christ. Our quest is for such unity as is compatible with freedom.'

This statement certainly does not exaggerate the part that has been played in the past by political pressure and the police power of the State in attempting to unify the Church, doctrinally and otherwise. As the Church now seeks unity it may well be warned by its own history not to seek a kind of unity that cannot be attained without violent and coercive means which no one here present would for an instant tolerate. The Church to-day has no Constantine and no Theodosius. It does not want one. Our quest must be for such unity as is compatible with freedom.

THIRD PAPER, BY DR. JOSEF HROMADKA

The analysis of non-theological factors has to be a self-examination, a rigid self-searching. It ought to be an earnest theological self-confrontation with the ultimate issues and facts of our faith. The situation in which we find ourselves, here at Lund, is a very, very grave one. Although the situation of the Church is always critical, our gathering at Lund goes in its gravity and in its potential dangers far beyond that of Edinburgh and that of Lausanne. Those who were present at Lausanne may well remember the calmness of those days. And although the Edinburgh Conference took place under the shadow of a perilous danger we, then, were still under the illusion of normal times. But now we are intensely aware of tensions the outcome of which we cannot foresee. It may prove to be the end of a great ecumenical era, but it may prove to be a victorious new beginning of mutual understanding and co-operation. The mercy of the living God is boundless

and beyond our comprehension. All depends on the perspective and on the attitude from which and with which we approach the great issues lying before us. The *reality* of the Church is not understandable if we tackle it purely theoretically and intellectually. And the same applies to the real worship of God and to our communion at the table of the Lord. Are we here gathered as theological theorists and ecclesiastical dignitaries, or primarily as lost sheep rescued by the suffering, crucified and risen Lord, trying to understand ourselves and to interpret our faith and actions?

Our conference is taking place in a time of profound shifts and changes in the very structure of our life and history—and we look at one another with apprehension, distrust and, at times, even suspicion. What I say may be an exaggeration, and yet let us not be too optimistic. We may speak the same doctrinal, dogmatic and theological language, and be separated from one another by such a gulf or barrier that we urgently have to ask ourselves whether our common doctrine has not degenerated and become an empty shell, meaningless for the present history of the Church. Our division cuts across our church organisations, common worship and sacramental forms. When listening to the address discussing the claims of free-churches versus what we call the state-churches I could not help feeling that in our particular situation this issue has become largely irrelevant. The same can be, in many ways, said about our controversy between the Catholic and Anglican tradition on the one hand and the Protestant and Evangelical conception of the Church on the other. Let us, in view of the terrific upheaval of our time, examine our own positions as to their integrity, and let us not forget that we might adhere to our particular liturgical, dogmatic and organisational forms for reasons which have little to do with the essential message of the Gospel.

I have had—like many of you—the depressing experience that my—hypothetically speaking—most provocative dogmatic heresies have been tolerated, overlooked or leniently listened to, whereas my Christian loyalty has been questioned on account of my political and social point of view and decision. What is, at times, happening in our congregations or local discussions may be true also in such a gathering as the present one. What is it that cements and integrates members of this conference into one organic unity? What are the ultimate, deepest, invisible, imperceptible,

and at the same time the most real motives and norms by which we are guided and which determine the way of our mutual approach? What has formed and shaped our preparations for Lund, what is forming and shaping our preparations for Lucknow and Evanston? We may be very sincere in emphasising with vigour our definite theological, biblical approach to any issue. And yet, somewhere at the bottom of our inward life, of our theological thought, may be a hidden ulterior driving force. Our struggle for an adequate understanding of the Word of God, of the Prophets, of the Gospel, of the Church, of its functions, may be, in a perilous way, coloured and transformed by our unconscious, or almost unconscious, social, political, cultural fears, anxieties and desires. (Secret, perceptible and imperceptible philosophical or metaphysical motives have been mentioned by other speakers.)

But let us look at it also from the opposite side: if we disagree among ourselves in our theological perspective, in either our Catholic or our Protestant emphases, we must carefully scrutinise our approach, our personal or ecclesiastical predilections and hobbies to see to what extent and in what measure they might have been prompted by some unavowed political or sociological pressure. There are people who use the Church and Christian ideology for a social or cultural self-protection. There exists a static orthodoxy as a trench or as a Maginot line of political fear, of social anxiety and conservatism. But the dangers are everywhere. It is here that I may call your attention to a serious situation we in our countries are confronted with. The tremendous changes in the very structure and the very formations of our social life have made our theology and Church much more watchful and responsible than they used to be before. All is at stake. We are realising what it means (*theologically speaking*) to walk between life and death. Every word and category, every traditional church activity has to be re-thought, re-interpreted, re-evaluated as to its integrity and relevance. Many of us have rejected the notion that we can hibernate behind the old walls of confession, doctrine or church constitution. The tremendous challenge which comes from the revolutionary socialistic ideology has one salutary effect. We have to go to the place where the Prophets heard the Word, where the Church of the Apostles had to walk—between Jerusalem with her devastated temple and Rome, the old

Rome of 1900 years ago, the new centre of the world. We have learned to-day to read the New Testament in a new, fresh and challenging way. Rom. 13 ('the powers that be are ordained of God') and Rev. 13 ('a beast coming up out of the sea') have to be re-read and reconsidered in view of our situation. We have come to understand in a very real manner the way of the Apostles as we know them from the Acts. Our present attitude to our state and civilisation might very easily be shaped by some petrified formulae either in a positive (according to Rom. 13) or a negative (according to Rev. 13) direction. How much we can learn from the sovereign faith of Paul who breaks with his own synagogue, his own holy city and temple of Jerusalem, appeals to his Roman citizenship and goes to Rome with a determination to defend his cause before the Caesar! The author of the Acts and the Church knew about the end of Paul at Rome, and yet there is in the book not a sign of hatred to Rome. Yes, we have sometimes to leave our Jerusalems and temples in order to carry out and justify our mission before a secular and allegedly hostile tribunal. But how sovereign and vigorous must be our faith and freedom to be able to do that! We have to give up all the myths, superstitions, empty speculations and idealistic illusions inherited from the past. We have to combat a self-pitying self-righteousness and to understand in what the *real* freedom of the Church consists. We have to give up many altars and idols.

May I say at this juncture a word about the *Entmythologisierung* method of Rudolf Bultmann? We do not accept his conclusions, but we realise that our inherited creeds and cults have been greatly corrupted and made empty by many old and new myths and superstitions. They must be subjected to a remorselessly critical analysis. To be a theologian to-day is to have a difficult vocation of courageous, fearless self-criticism and of a relentless burrowing into the soil of the Church. It is a difficult but a glorious vocation. We have to be on the alert lest we misread the signs of our times and lest we exchange new myths for the old ones.

In what way can we help one another? We are constantly tempted to sit in judgment upon one another and do it in a wrong way. Political prejudices, fixed cultural ideas and social loyalties are so strong that we are unaware of them. In the East we are tempted to sit in judgment upon Christians in the West. In the West there is a temptation to judge Christians in the East.

All of us are in peril of self-righteousness and self-complacency. The more vigorously we identify ourselves with a given social structure, political régime and cultural tradition, the more uneasy and irritated we get if anybody questions the purity and integrity of our actions, of our theology and faith. We have become servants and slaves of our social and cultural tradition and use the most sacred theological formulae and church decisions to protect them. It is discouraging and depressing to see how profoundly our interpretations and evaluations of contemporary social and international events differ from and contradict one another. All the momentous problems of our time (Communism, the Korean War, the new China, the unification and neutralisation of Germany, the North Atlantic Pact, European Federation, the Peace Movement) stand like colossal blocks between us. To what extent are these differences and contradictions an indication of our theological disagreements, of our disunity in faith and hope? The questions I am raising are not academic questions. They pierce deeply into the body of Christendom as it is to-day.

All of us agree that the prophetic ministry is one of the essential forms of ministry of the Church of Christ. Just as our Lord has prophetic, priestly and royal functions, so we have to carry a mission which reflects all of them. Let us speak especially of our prophetic mission. All of us, as we are gathered here, long to proclaim a real prophetic message, a prophetic word straight into a given situation. Yet all of us are in danger of self-illusion. The prophetic word defies all our theological patterns of prophecy. *Spiritus ubi vult spirat* (John 3.8). The prophetic word deprives man of all his human treasures, political, national, social and cultural, strips him naked, takes away his self-assurance, self-righteousness, self-complacency, drags him against his own will to the place where the genuine fire of the divine presence burns until the servant of God stands, without any pious weapon or prop and human support, as a beggar and a lost sheep. 'Ah, Lord God! behold, I cannot speak! for I am a child' (Jer. 1.6).

When do we speak actually, genuinely, in the name of the Lord, and not in the interest of *our* way of life, of our culture, of our political, social, economic vested interests? There exists among theologians and churchmen a curious idea that a prophetic word is regularly a negative word, a word of defiance and protest. There are Christians whose eyes are fascinated and horrified,

even stupefied by the dark shadow of Communism. They project all the corruptions and ideas they hold of Satanic, devilish destruction into the advance of communist power. They almost identify the present prophetic function of the Church with its anti-communist proclamation, with its resounding 'No' against Communism. It is exactly this that we—who live behind the Iron Curtain and who are at present responsible for the affairs of our Churches—reject. Yes, indeed, there are inevitable 'No's' to be proclaimed as in any human situation. But we insist that our first prophetic word must be a 'Yes', a persistent as well as a joyful 'Yes' to the Lord Crucified and Risen, who has put us into our situation. The Christian message always begins with 'Yes'.

I wish to stress most emphatically that this does not imply a 'Yes' to any system, to any official ideology or to everything that goes on. It means simply that we have to make decisions in the sovereignty of faith, no matter how difficult and questionable they may appear to a traditional churchman or to our brethren who are not on the spot and cannot always understand what we do.

What does it mean if we differ so deeply in practical application of the prophetic mission of the Church? Is this not a challenge to re-examine our christological doctrines and to perceive in what way and to what extent political, social and cultural interests have penetrated into our theological thought and ecclesiastical action? To help one another to a real Christian liberty, to a real sovereignty of faith, and to a real unity?

We must meet, in this spirit, the challenge of Marxism and what it represents. First of all, we have to understand the real effort of the Marxists to reconstruct our social order, to raise the working class to a level of active participation in the shaping of human conditions, to establish a society in which all class differences and injustices would disappear. We must understand *why* it is precisely the Marxists who have taken over the historic rôle of socialising our countries. Moreover, Marxism is a special challenge to the Christian Churches because it is being taken seriously by its followers, while Christians are largely guilty of having no burning convictions. Many Churches have degenerated into empty conventions and institutions.

Only if we say that, can we adequately defend some fundamental truths for which we must stand without reserve. First, the

highest, supreme authority for us can never be a human authority, no matter how earnestly we may acknowledge its validity within the realms of earthly, social and political life. The final authority belongs to Christ, to Him alone. That is the foundation of all *true* freedom. Secondly, the only way to safeguard the true dignity of man is to conceive him in the light of the Gospel. Personally I esteem highly the efforts to create such social and economic conditions that men may be free from poverty, social injustice and insecurity. But I know that the ultimate way to protect him before all human corruption, destruction, threat and tyranny can be only the way of Christ, who descended to where we are, even into hell, in order to take upon Himself our corruption and to guard us *at the bottom of our human existence* against all visible and invisible, perceptible and imperceptible, inward and outward forces of evil. Thirdly, even in a classless society there will be sinners. The classless society is not the end of history. Human sin transcends the boundaries of every political and social system, no matter how perfect it may be. Man will always need the message of forgiveness, grace and mercy; man will always need the atmosphere of human love and mercy without which any collective life would degenerate into a cold, depressing and unbearable mechanism. Thus the Church, the *truly* faithful Church, need have no fear for its future.

My questions and comments may have sounded a little pessimistic. However, I am not a pessimist. In all humility and love, I desire to contribute to the real success of our conference. It was a salutary suggestion to start with what we call non-theological factors. It is a kind of self-purification. But it must be a true *theological* self-examination. It must be a struggle within ourselves. The Church must remove—under the guidance of the Holy Spirit—all its idols and false altars. It must struggle with the Antichrist in its own sanctuary and not look for devils where they are nothing more than creations of our fear and our human phantasy. Only if it has chased the Antichrist out of its own temple and pulpit will it be competent and strong enough to struggle with real evil, wherever it may threaten our human existence.

There followed these two contributions by speakers called to the platform by the President of the Conference.

BISHOP PÉTER OF THE HUNGARIAN
REFORMED CHURCH

Most Reverend President, I have come from Hungary, and in the very moment of our discussion on the so-called non-theological factors I am glad to present to this conference the fraternal greetings of the Protestant congregations of my country. Not only the official bodies of the Hungarian Protestant Churches, but also their congregations are interested in the Lund Conference.

The Most Reverend President of our conference was so kind as to mention with a certain emphasis the presence here of the delegations from Czechoslovakia and Hungary. First of all I would like to refer to his kind words. I quote: 'We welcome warmly the delegations from Czechoslovakia and Hungary and pray that, in these days together, meeting upon the deep matters of our common faith, much may be said and done to deepen love and mutual understanding and nothing to increase the world's all-too-large stores of suspicion and misrepresentation.'

Most Reverend President, I am sure that in this very moment of the world and church situation we have every ground to pray so in this conference and not only here but in our congregations as well. Perhaps it won't be useless to know that in the Presbyterian, Lutheran, Baptist and Methodist congregations in Hungary they are in these days praying for the good works of our conference. Our congregations beseech God that He grant us in our meeting His gracious gifts in order to deepen mutual understanding and to avoid the increase of dissensions. Since the ecumenical task is not only a matter of the governing bodies of Churches but above all a matter of the congregations, we have done our best to inform all Protestant congregations about what has been done to prepare for this conference, and what is to be awaited from the results of our present meeting. All of our professors of theology and many church ministers have studied for months the preparatory material published by the Faith and Order Commission. The results of these studies are being published in the pages of the Hungarian Church Press in English, German and French. In this publication we express the subject of the hope of our congregations by these words: 'The results of the Lund Conference may furnish help to the Church in obediently fulfilling our *common* service.'

Secondly, I would like to refer to a question of the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches. He said in his most interesting speech—I quote again: ‘Will our attempts to maintain the spiritual unity of our fellowship as between Christians in Eastern Europe and China on the one hand and those in other nations succeed, or are the forces of misunderstanding too strong for the Church?’ All of us are aware of the significance of this question. Yes, there have been signs enough which could endanger this existing spiritual unity. But the very fact that since the second world war even in the time of the so-called Iron Curtain more church visitors were in Hungary from the West, and more church visitors went abroad from Hungary, than between the two world wars, this fact in itself shows how much can be done to safeguard the spiritual unity of the Church. We wish to continue our ecumenical dialogue, and we suppose with confidence that all the responsible members of our movement wish to do so. Otherwise what will happen to our movement? If the ecumenical movement by such and such way achieved a certain organisational union of certain Churches but at the same time lost contact with the Orthodox Church, with the Churches of China and Asia and with the Churches of Eastern Europe, in this case the union so achieved wouldn’t be other than a mutilated and artificial federation within the framework of a *bloc*, the essence of which is wholly strange to the essence of the Church. It would certainly mean the failure of the ecumenical movement from the very point of view of the Church.

Referring once again to this significant question of the General Secretary, I would like to put forward some short proposals for our section discussions upon the so-called non-theological factors.

First, in dealing with social and cultural factors the designation ‘non-theological factors’ should be avoided in our discussion. That is not a theoretical proposal, but I hope it has consequences for the cause of unity. Indeed, there are economic, social, cultural, political, psychological and other factors which may influence the agreements and discussions of the denominations, but the Church is unable to give real ecclesiastical answers to them until she is able to understand them under theological conditions and with theological qualifications. To the extent the Church treats and gives a sphere of influence to these factors as non-theological factors, to the same extent will her attitude to these become an

uneclesiastical attitude, but to the same extent will her attitude to these factors become a truly ecclesiastical attitude inasmuch as she observes, treats and experiences these factors under the conditions and with the qualification of the Word of God. These factors may divide us even in the Church if we deal with them as non-theological factors, but if we search for the real ecclesiastical answers to these factors we may fortify our unity even in answering these factors. If we prefer to employ general qualifications let us call them simply human factors, but let us confront them under theological conditions. In this way our spiritual unity will be strengthened even in the presence of these factors.

Secondly, in the name of our ecumenical study committee I propose to express somewhere in the report of our conference that such a struggle for organisational unity which threatens the existing spiritual unity, is somehow erroneous and must be avoided in the ecumenical movement.

Thirdly, in the same way I propose to express that the goal of unity is not an isolated task beside other tasks of the Church. Divisions issue from disobedience. Conversely, renewed unity can only be the fruit of spiritual renewal and obedience. Disobedient attempts towards unity can only deepen our dissensions. The right way of seeking the unity of the Church is to seek, in a common effort, the way of common obedience in all aspects of the Church's life. In seeking unity we have to give common answers to our common questions, we have to show a common attitude to common dangers of the present generation.

Fourthly, in the ecumenical dialogue the wholeness of the Church has gained its due interest, but we think it would also be necessary to turn our attention more closely than before to the congregations in which the life of the Church is taking place. We should ask again and again what communion our congregations have with the work we are performing in ecumenical talks. It is also a rule of the one Body that the ecumenical discussions would cease to be truly ecclesiastical discussions if they barred that specific message which God addresses, through preaching, to the local congregations and, through them, to the Church Universal.

Finally, because of the various theological problems which confront us in our actual ecumenical dialogues, the Faith and Order work should further constitute the very heart of ecumenical

activity. Therefore we understand that in the Sub-committee on the Structure of Faith and Order after Lund even such an opinion was expressed—I quote: ‘No radical change in the constitution of Faith and Order should be contemplated in this early stage of its participation in the World Council of Churches.’ We hope that this conference will find the new form of the Faith and Order work in which Faith and Order may realise its best services and traditions in the ecumenical movement.

In putting forward our proposals, we would like to strengthen our hope that the preparation of a new stage of the ecumenical movement will help to safeguard our spiritual unity.

PASTOR MAURY

The division of the Churches has not only spiritual causes. But the search for unity may, in an equally disputable way, include ‘non-theological factors’. For the world too dreams of unity, and is ready to mobilise the Churches in the huge gatherings through which it seeks to realise its dreams. But this unity according to the world is not that which Jesus Christ commanded and promised to His disciples. The ecumenical movement ought to be particularly vigilant here; for if it yielded to these external pressures, not only would all be over with its existence, but it might perhaps prove to have been a diabolical enterprise.

I will give a concrete example. If the unity of the Churches appeared impossible through their drawing together spiritually, and yet came about through their participation in an anti-Communist crusade, it would certainly be a tragic failure. Inversely, if the Churches welcomed the possibility—admittedly at the moment not very likely—of realising this unity by means of collaboration in these peace movements whose partisan origins and intentions are well known, this could only prove the condemnation of the Church itself.

Is it necessary to conclude that the ecumenical movement, in order to preserve the purity of its own motives, i.e. their theological character, ought to abstain from any preoccupation with, and even from any decision in, the realm of the concrete circumstances of our time? I do not believe that. For such an abstention would manifest not only a lack of courage and of a sense of actuality, but also a serious theological weakening.

The world and history and the relation of both to the Church have a theological significance. This is obscure, and will remain so until the day when the judgment of God will end history. But the Church may not invoke this obscurity so as to take refuge in a withdrawal from the world and from history. I say this with all the greater conviction because at this moment the ecumenical movement is showing a remarkable, necessary, indispensable interest in what theologians call 'eschatology', i.e. that which is beyond history. If this interest results in escape into pious fancies or dreams of the future I think it will lose all its spiritual and theological meaning.

The Christ who will return is only known if He is the same Christ who is present and the Christ whose earthly history led from Bethlehem to Jerusalem. To wait for Him is to remember Him and to be willing to be guided by Him.

Now it seems to me that this Christ, who is our hope and our present inspiration, is always one step further than we have yet gone with Him. Let me give an illustration. The Church, it has been said, has frontiers. This is inevitable and good, on condition that, as in a country at war, her true life takes place on her frontiers. Only on this frontier of combat she perceives, ahead of her and on the far side of those limits which still enclose her, Him for whom and by whom she lives and fights. This Christ on the other side of the frontier has not left His Church, but is opening up for her the way to new victories in the world. It is in following Him there where He is, among these indifferent or hostile men outside, for whom the Church in its timidity often dares not hope, that our unity will be realised; for we know that this unity is not reserved for us, but that the Lord wills it for the whole of humanity.

CHAPTER 6

THE WORLD MISSION OF THE CHURCH



On the evening of Monday, August 18th, a public meeting was held in the Aula of the University, which was open, not only to all conference delegates and other participants, but also to any members of the public who were interested and able to follow the addresses given in English. The purpose of the meeting was to set the Conference on Faith and Order in the whole context of the evangelisation of the world. In the following pages is printed the substance of the addresses given by the chairman, Dr. Henry Smith Leiper (who was making his last appearance as an Associate General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, before taking on the post of Executive Secretary of the Missions Council of the Congregational Christian Churches, U.S.A.), and by three other speakers.

CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS, BY DR. HENRY SMITH LEIPER

If you wish to understand with the heart as well as the head what William Temple calls St. Paul's horror of Christian divisiveness, take a turn at being a missionary evangelist in a non-Christian land where the total church constituency is less than one in a thousand of the population and there are 185 different denominations! It was from such an experience in China that I went to Lausanne in 1927. Five years earlier in Peking I had attended my first ecumenical conference at the W.S.C.F. There I had seen the potential of a mood and a movement which promised some answer to a missionary's prayer. That same year of 1922 the I.M.C. came into formal existence. Two years before Lausanne, the Life and Work movement had begun in Stockholm. Intense conviction of the relevance of unity to the world mission soon led me into the ecumenical movement (not as a substitute for the missionary enterprise but as something essential to its success).

For twenty-two years and through a million miles of travel in thirty-seven lands I have watched its development and had some small share in its expanding activity. When William Paton (an I.M.C. secretary) and I (a secretary of Life and Work) were asked to prepare the opening statement which I presented at the Edinburgh Conference of 1937 our two organisations were officially miles apart. But by that date Faith and Order had come closer to Life and Work and was soon to join with it in the World Council Provisional Committee to which Paton and I, as associates under the brilliant leadership of Dr. Visser 't Hooft, were called with him in 1938.

A missionary appreciates likewise the profound truth of Canon Wedel's recent statement in the *Ecumenical Review*, '*Christianity without the Church is unthinkable*'. And because of what we have seen of the dependence of the world mission on the Church, we who have had active service in the mission field know that as truly as *a world mission without an urge to unity is unthinkable, a Christian Church without a consciousness of world mission ought to be also unthinkable.*

Yet even in this latter day many Christians persist in thinking of the Church parochially, racially, nationalistically, or regionally. They are often quite definite in their adherence to the view that when God wants the non-Christians to become Christians He will convert them without any help from other Christians. In that they remind one of those other numerous Christians who apply a similar evasive formula to the problem of unity and say: 'When God wants the Churches to unite He will make them unite. So there is nothing we need do about it.'

But one dares to repeat again the idea which is common among us here, that *a Church without a world mission is not a Christian Church*. It does not bear witness to God's only Son whom He gave because He so loved the world and who is the Creator of all men. We are indebted to Professor Foster of Scotland for the reminder, in his book *After the Apostles*, that the early advocates of Christianity could write scarcely three sentences before they were dealing with the Christian Community. They conceived this community as without geographical, ethnic or denominational frontiers. They (perhaps better than modern Christians) would instantly understand and approve the definition of a Christian which Richard Niebuhr has given us in his recent book, *Christ*

and Culture. His statement freely rendered is: 'A Christian is a person who thinks of himself as belonging to that community throughout the world for which Jesus Christ—His life, His deeds, His teaching, His destiny—provides the key to an understanding of God and man, of good and evil, the constant companion of the conscience, and the hope of ultimate conquest over evil.'

An ecumenical movement without a sense of world mission to spread that community in Christ is a complete anomaly. To-day, it would be an anachronism. None of us who heard him say it will ever forget William Temple's word as he reminded the great congregation at his consecration as Archbishop of Canterbury, that out of the world missionary movement of the past 130 years has come the fellowship which corresponds to St. Paul's vision of the Church. This fellowship was not planned by any human wisdom. In the providence of God, ruling and overruling the plans and activities of divided Churches, this great fellowship has arisen and is '*the great fact of our time*'.

It is clearer now than it was ten years ago when the first President of the World Council's Provisional Committee spoke these words that there are two world missions, involving now literally almost all the world. The one is the communist world mission (although it is not called that). The other is the Christian world mission. The latter simply cannot operate without taking account of the former. In the former, the acceptance of the world-wide character of its mission is axiomatic. It seeks to create a communist world community, often with great zeal and personal self-sacrifice. In the latter it is too often, even now, subject to debate. In the communist world mission, there is enforced an almost undisputed unity: a unity of strategy and of command. In the Christian world mission, we have no desire to emulate such a totalitarian scheme; but we do well to recognise the disadvantage which the Christian confronts, that neither the strategy nor the administration of its world mission *is* unified. Its ideology is not even clear—not to say unified.

There is, however, justifiable comfort to be derived from the fact that the outreach for unity in the sense of acceptance of community has been the distinguishing characteristic of this generation. It is no accident that those most deeply concerned with the world mission of the Church have been most equally concerned

about its *unity*. Several times this meeting has been reminded of the fact that Bishop Brent was a missionary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. Humanly speaking, he, more than any other person, was the founder of the Faith and Order Movement. Dr. John R. Mott, who laid so many of the foundations of the present movement for co-operation and unity, had his first introduction to the ecumenical idea as a leader of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions. These are among the many who have seen that *wholeness of spiritual life in the Churches* is the only ultimate thing which the world can take as a promise that the Church can minister to a divided world desperate because of its lack of wholeness. As unity has advanced the rate of evangelism has gone up since Lausanne in one hundred and twenty areas four times over.

It has been said repeatedly of the ecumenical movement that it is a reassertion of Christian community, not for its own sake but for the sake of the world for which Christ died. As my colleague, Dr. Frederick Nolde, the able director of the Joint Commission of the International Missionary Council and the World Council on International Affairs, has said: 'We are undertaking our tasks and doing these varied things in the ecumenical movement not simply because they are good for the Church. If they are not good for the world, then in a basic sense they are not worthwhile for the Church.' The gospel which preaches but does not manifest the oneness of God's family, is irrelevant to our kind of world. Perhaps we must also add: it promotes cynicism and invites to agnosticism. If it is not obvious to the Christian, it is certainly obvious to his critics that those who declare God to be the Creator and Father of all mankind, are, inevitably, themselves sharers of a common responsibility and a common destiny. He thinks they ought to be able to make their consciousness of community visible to the world. The World Council and the International Missionary Council both represent attempts to make visible the existing spiritual oneness of a great cross-section of Christendom. We are engaged in an attempt to fulfil the conditions for the realisation of our Lord's high priestly prayer that His followers might be one. We are engaged in an attempt to recover both the sense and the substance of that community which was so real to the first Christians and apart from which the world will not believe.

The world will best understand what that community should be like if we take every opportunity to remind ourselves and others that Jesus found the pattern of spiritual community in that primary human community which is the family. His language, His parables, the very terms in which He spoke of God, and even the form of His great high priestly prayer are proof of this. We are to be, as common members of God's one family, united as the Father and the Son are united. That is quite clearly a family relationship. We do not create family relationships. We manifest them. Or what is more common—we fail to manifest them. Very naturally, in consequence of our failure, the world continues in its unbelief.

Yet the ecumenical movement already possesses something of the spiritual unity of a true family of God. In what we are to hear to-night from three distinguished representatives of the world-wide Christian fellowship, we shall be vividly reminded of the inevitability of the connection between the Church's mission and unity. Happily, we are at last able to speak to one another across the national and racial as well as the confessional divisions of our shrinking world. In this fellowship we speak as those already gratefully conscious of the oneness which we have in Christ. It would be, I am sure, the wish of my colleagues as it is my wish, that through all that we do and are in the ecumenical movement we may help to make clear that the salvation which is in Christ is a kind of total spiritual health, or wholeness. The very word 'salvation' derives from the Latin word for 'health', just as the English word for 'health' derives from the word 'wholeth' or 'hailth'. To the sick world's individual men and women the Church offers (through its preaching of the gospel of Christ) wholeness of life in Him in whom all fulness dwells. To the nations, the races and the classes, it must preach that wholeness of life which will make possible community where now there is chaos. When we preach by demonstrations of wholeness in the Church, we shall have brought into their natural relationship both our emphasis on mission and our advocacy of unity. Until we do, the world may well say to us who claim to represent Christ's body, what the scoffers said to our Lord: 'Physician, heal thyself.'

THE CALLING OF THE CHURCH TO MISSION AND
UNITY BY RAJAH B. MANIKAM

*(East Asia Secretary of the World Council of Churches and the
International Missionary Council, India)*

I am to speak on the calling of the Church to Mission and Unity from the point of view of the Younger Churches in East Asia. Let me at the outset emphasise the inseparable oneness of Mission and Unity—the two poles of the ecumenical movement—which oneness is basic to all the issues we face to-day in the life and work of the Church. It is quite clear in the New Testament that the Church is called to undertake two tasks: (a) to proclaim the Gospel to the whole world, and (b) to manifest at the same time in and to the world the unity that is in Christ. Jesus prayed for His disciples that they might be one in Him, as He and the Father are one. But what is this oneness for? That the world might believe that the Father had sent Him—one that the world might believe—Unity and Mission.

So then, these two aspects of Mission and Unity are interdependent. There is an essential connection between the missionary function of the Church (its apostolate) and its obligation to be one (its catholicity). But sometimes we have separated these two callings, and have tended to emphasise one to the detriment of the other. We often think of the missionary movement in the world as standing for the Mission of the Church, and the ecumenical movement for the Unity of the Church. This is clearly faulty thinking. The missionary movement from the very beginning has been imbued with a deep sense of the calling to unity. The Gospel is one, the world is one. Therefore the ambassadors of Christ could not fail to see a vision of unity which transcended the divisions of the Church. As the Younger Churches came into existence, and in some cases have formed united Churches of their own, the world-wide Church has been constrained to think afresh about its unity. In fact, will it not be true to say that the missionary movement stimulated the movement towards unity? On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that the movement towards unity has been from the outset concerning itself with the Church's mission to the world. Only together can Christians give their true witness and render effective service to the world.

Questions referring to the *Una Sancta* being an end or a means to an end, its relation to the concept of the Kingdom of God, what forms unity should take in order to manifest its witness, and whether Christian unity can be realised in history—these will need further study. But it is quite clear that if the Church is to demonstrate the Gospel in its preaching and life, it must make clear to the whole world the power of God to break down all barriers and to establish the Church's unity in Christ. Is Christ divided? No.

Bearing in mind this inseparable oneness of Mission and Unity, let us turn to the Asian scene. In the providence of God, through the labours of the missionaries of the Cross, Churches have been established in practically every country in East Asia. The most Christian country in the East to-day is the Philippines, where out of a population of 17 millions, about 15 millions are Christians to-day. Next comes my own country of India which, together with Pakistan, has about 10 million Christians. This is no insignificant number to be despised. It is much more than the entire population of Sweden where we are meeting now! Third comes Indonesia where there are more Christians than in China and Japan put together—about three million Christians in Indonesia. However, on the other side, we find Thailand with a very small Christian community, perhaps the smallest in East Asia.

While we have reason to thank God for the Churches in East Asia, we must not forget that more than one half of the world's population lives in this small section of the world's territory. Out of these 1,100 millions, at a generous estimate only 50 millions are Christians (Roman and non-Roman). With the exception of the Philippines, the Christian Churches in the rest of East Asia constitute a tiny minority in the vast population that lives in these countries. What are 10 million Christians out of 400 millions in India and Pakistan, or three million Christians out of 70 millions in Indonesia?

The very vastness of the unfinished task of the Church in East Asia has compelled the denominations to think in terms of co-operation, pooling of resources, sharing of experiences and insights, and coming together in unity. In many of these lands, Christian Councils on a national scale are functioning to-day. Rules governing comity among the Churches, and interchange

of Christians migrating from one place to another, have constrained the Churches to think of those things that are common and that can unite them rather than those things which divide. Negotiations along these lines have finally resulted in church union conversations and, in some cases, in actual unions. If once the Younger Churches of their own free will are agreed upon a certain essential basis for union, is it not right for them to enter into union, even though they may not have reached agreement on every doctrine and dogma, but in the hope that the power of the Holy Spirit to lead men anew is not limited to-day, that therefore in growing together in fellowship under His leadership He may knit them in closer unity? This seems to have been the guiding principle which has led to the formation of one of the great united Churches in East Asia.

However, though co-operation and association may be good in themselves, often the good becomes the enemy of the best. Instead of being milestones towards the goal of unity, they become often millstones weighing us down and impeding further progress towards the goal of unity. Divisions in the Church, when unreconciled, distort its nature and unity and frustrate its mission. The small Christian community in our countries cannot afford to be split up into further small groups.

One must also remember that there are indeed certain principles of difference among the Churches which are so fundamental that no compromise should be made or accommodation found. Many of us come from Churches which value their heritage very highly, and we cannot talk lightly of deep-rooted convictions, fundamental beliefs and the distinctive witness of our Churches. But I sometimes wonder whether behind the exaggerated claims of us all to the 'distinctive witness' of our Churches, there may not lie some kind of spiritual or corporate pride. The missionaries who brought us the Gospel brought with them their own spiritual paraphernalia. They no doubt gave us what was best in their own spiritual upbringing. But is it not also true to say that they have projected into the Asian scene their own differences in their countries, and their own pet theories? Have they not introduced many non-theological factors which often make impossible the coming together of masses of Asian Christians to whom such factors have little or no meaning? We often find even within one denomination, separate Churches owing different loyalties to

different parent Churches, simply because the missionaries of that same denomination hailed from different countries in Europe.

Very often an Asian Christian is a member of one denomination, not as a result of comparative study of the dogmas of the different Churches and the resultant conviction that that one denomination is the best, but because of the accident that the missionary who converted him or his forefathers belonged to a particular denomination. Some of such Christians soon discover a reassuring theological formula which justifies why they are different from their fellow-Christians. For many lay people, the arguments produced by the theological experts are merely justification *after* the event. Yes, it is true that ecclesiastical divisions appeal to and find their justification in theological differences. But does it follow that they are necessarily caused by them alone?

It is not uncommon to find the bitter enemies of church union in the East among the ranks of Asian Christians rather than among the foreign missionaries. Some Asian Christians with their love for divisions and argumentation have taken to these ecclesiastical differences as the duck takes to the water. Sometimes even questionable motives such as the fear of losing financial support from the missionary society connected with the Church, especially if it happens to be an American society, have impeded progress in union negotiations. It is not uncommon to find missionary societies and parent Churches exercising undue influence over the Younger Churches and thus fettering their freedom of decision in such matters.

These and other factors have wrought havoc in the Church's united witness in a non-Christian East Asia. India alone has more than 200 denominational societies at work to win India to Christ! Into Japan, since the war, have entered fifty-five new sects! The attempt to make out of a Northern Korean or a Formosan a Southern Baptist must seem somewhat incongruous even to a benighted oriental. Now that China has been closed to foreign missionary work, missionary societies are sending their personnel in large numbers to other countries without sometimes any consultation with the Christian forces working in them. In Formosa, Indonesia and Malaya, this problem is acute.

I can never forget the incident of a professor of philosophy in one of our universities in India telling his friends that he believed in Jesus Christ as *the Way, the Truth and the Life*. But when asked

why then he had not sought membership in a Church, he replied with biting sarcasm: 'Which Church, please?' Yes, by our divisions and disunity, which make very little sense to the non-Christian in Asia, we are impeding the progress of the Kingdom of God. This is a terrible judgment indeed. In this connection one is reminded that there is a strong non-church movement in Japan to-day, largely because people are tired of the scandal of our divisions.

Perhaps I have painted the Asian scene darker than it really is. As a welcome contrast to what has been said above, one rejoices to find that the Holy Spirit is moving in the hearts of Asian Christians to-day and bringing them together as never before.

In Japan there exists to-day 'the United Church of Christ in Japan' (Kyodan) in which have merged fifteen denominations. It is often said that church union there has been the result of the totalitarian policy of the then government, but this is only a half truth, since church union negotiations under the N.C.C. date as far back as 1935. Some Churches which joined the Kyodan have withdrawn but they formed only 3 per cent. of the Churches in the Kyodan. A few are still considering withdrawal. The discussion centres on the questions of a credal basis and decentralisation. About 60-70 per cent. of the entire Protestant church membership in Japan is found in this Church, which has a baptised membership of 151,965 with 1,499 congregations and evangelistic centres. The Kyodan has come to stay.

In the Philippines, since 1948, 'the United Church of Christ in the Philippines' is functioning. The United Evangelical Church of the Philippines, the Evangelical Church, and the Philippine Methodist Church are members of this United Church, but within this unity, each of the uniting Churches preserves its own special heritage of faith and witness. This Church is episcopal but does not adhere to the historic episcopal succession. It has a membership of about 125,000.

While these two United Churches still retain some of the characteristics of a Federation, we have in the Church of South India real organic church union. The Church of India, Burma and Ceylon (Southern Anglican dioceses), the South India United Church (Congregational, Presbyterian and Reformed) and the Methodist Church in South India united to form one Church of South India in 1947. This Church has over a million

members with fourteen dioceses. It has now three types of ministry—those episcopally ordained before union, those not so ordained, and those ordained after union by bishops. After a thirty-year period, the Church is to decide whether any exceptions to the rule of episcopal ordination should be allowed. The Lambeth Conference in 1948 welcomed the formation of the new Church, but did not recommend terms of full intercommunion between Anglican Churches and the C.S.I. The Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon (C.I.P.B.C.) has recognised as valid the ordinations that have taken place in the C.S.I. since union. Conversations are going on between the C.S.I. and the Lutherans and the Baptists, with some degree of hope in the former case. It is significant that a union, motivated from the beginning by the missionary calling of the three separated Churches, has resulted in a deepening sense of the mission of the Church and a new boldness in evangelism.

Negotiations are under way in Ceylon. While in the C.S.I. we have for the first time an Episcopal Church in Asia in union with non-Episcopal Churches, in Ceylon the Baptists are considering union. The negotiating Churches are the C.S.I., the C.I.P.B.C., the Methodist and the Presbyterian Churches. In North India, negotiations are proceeding among Churches which include the C.I.P.B.C. and the Baptists. In Indonesia there exists a Protestant Church of Indonesia with a membership of 697,000. This Church has still retained some of the characteristics of a Federation. An Indonesian Council of Churches is in existence to-day, and its avowed aim is to further the cause of church union in Indonesia.

These are some of the significant and hopeful developments in East Asia. It may be that in the providence of God the younger Churches untrammelled by the weight of history and tradition may lead the way to unity in Christ. While the older Churches may engage in theological discussions as to whether church union is desirable or necessary, to the younger Churches it has become an imperative, a necessity, a matter of life and death. The eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries witnessed the great missionary expansion of the Church, but the signs of the twentieth century make it clear that the Holy Spirit is leading the Churches, not only to proclaim the Gospel to the whole world but also to manifest in and to that world the fellowship and unity which is in Christ Jesus.

SUMMARY OF ADDRESS BY THE
REV. D. T. NILES*(Methodist Church in Ceylon)*

One is not a Christian because one worships Christ. There are Hindus who worship Christ. One is a Christian only if one proclaims Christ as Him whom all men must worship. Jesus is truth, not value. The Gospel is contemporary fact. One does not understand the Gospel unless one shares in it; and one does not share in it except as, a confessing Christian, one is seeking to lead persons to Jesus Christ.

The word 'persons' must be underlined for, unless the Gospel is known in the person to person relation as God's power unto salvation, it does not become definitive for the life of Christian obedience. The Gospel does not find us as persons until we begin to address it to persons, not merely to groups or types. We must follow Jesus into the lives which He is seeking to make His own. We must be constantly carrying in our hearts concern for persons who do not know Christ.

It is easy to slip into a life where one's evangelistic activity is mainly and sometimes wholly impersonal. When this happens we begin to preach Christianity, not the Gospel. The distinction between Christianity and the Gospel is a distinction we must constantly maintain and live by. It defines the evangelistic position. Unless Christianity is seen as standing under the Gospel, the ecumenical task becomes an impossibility.

But this person to person relation is only the woof. The warp is the relation of the Church to the world. The Christian is a member of the Church. This is not to say that Christians together form the Church. We do not form the Church, the Church overtakes us. We belong. We belong as witnesses. The Church is the instrument of God in history. It lives between the Red Sea and the River Jordan. It lives a pilgrim life. It also lives by anticipation, for its life is that of a besieged city which lives by the hope of its deliverance.

The witness of the evangelist, therefore, which is addressed to the person must be supported by, and be rooted in, the witness of the Church which is addressed to the hour. Different parts of the world are at different moments of history. And to address the

Gospel to the hour means nothing less than to live with Jesus in each country under the conditions of life in that country, there to be heard gladly, then to be turned against, to be rejected and killed, and to rise again.

At Amsterdam we took a pledge to stay together. That means also that we stay with each other. There is no closed door through which a Church cannot enter into fellowship with another Church. The key of every door is with Him. We must learn to jump over barriers. It is as we stay with one another that we shall find the nature of our unity. We must first stay with one another before we can conceptualise what that staying together means.

The recurrent theme of the last discourses of Jesus and of His high-priestly prayer is: Love one another even as I have loved you. Unity and sanctification in the truth are possible only to those who love. Are the barriers between us barriers which God has erected? Our ecumenical conversation must be an attempt to answer His questions, not the questions which we ask of each other. The truth about God is the truth about the nature of His love. Why was Jesus crucified?

A place of confluence is a place of pilgrimage. Will we meet Him here? We will, for even though it is only a stable we offer Him, yet He will come. 'Behold I stand at the door and knock. Let any man open and I will come in.'

THE CALLING OF THE CHURCHES OF THE NEAR
EAST TO MISSION AND TO UNITY
BY THE REV. FARID AUDEH

(President of the Supreme Council of the Evangelical Churches in Syria and Lebanon, and Chairman of the Near East Christian Council)

I bring you greetings from the Holy Land, which reminds this great World Conference of the One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church of the First Century. I was born not far away from Bethlehem, educated and ordained to the ministry in Jerusalem, and served my Saviour as pastor of 'Christ Church' in Nazareth for nine years, in Jaffa (the old Joppa), in Haifa (built on Mount Carmel), and now in Beirut, Lebanon.

I bring you greetings from the Christians of the Holy Land and the Near East who have been faithful to Christ since the first

century, despite the indescribable persecutions throughout the centuries.

I come from an Arab family. When Europeans and Americans hear the word 'Arab', they think it means 'Moslem'. But they forget that Arab Christians existed before Mohammed came (and yet we are called Younger Churches!). Arab Christians suffered all kinds of persecutions and humiliation during the five hundred years of the dark Turkish Régime which lasted until the First World War. Alas! This persecution of Christians has continued until the present day. The massacres of the Armenians and Assyrians, the burning of the homes and properties of Christians in Cairo on the 26th of last January, and the expulsion of 100,000 Arab Christians from Palestine by Israel—are only recent events.

In the name of the Christians of these countries, I bring you greetings. And I need not say how much the Christians of the Near East look to this great gathering for guidance, encouragement, and inspiration.

I. Problems that Confront the Christian Church in the Near East

The Near East is the birthplace of the three great monotheistic religions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Nowhere else in the world are these three religions brought into such close contact, competition, and antagonism. The memory of the Crusades has not yet faded from their minds.

The first problem that confronts the Christian Church in the Near East is the spirit of extreme, intensive and sometimes unhealthy nationalism. It is directed both against the influence of the strong nations of the West and against the threat of Soviet Communism. The countries of the Near East have been taught many high ideals of conduct by representatives of the West; now the West appears to be acting in a way contrary to these very ideals. One result of the consequent anti-western feeling, and at the same time of the fear of Communist influence, is a tendency to turn back to Islam as a centre of nationalistic enthusiasm. Then comes Communism as a third problem; and what is most pitiful and terrifying is that Communism is active even in some of the Christian Churches. Fourthly, the formation of Israel has created a state of war between the Arab states and Israel during the last fifty-six months. It also created problems for missions which at one point seemed on the verge of extinction, and a vast refugee

problem: 850,000 Arabs, of whom 100,000 are Christians, were forced to leave their homes and find refuge in neighbouring countries. For the last four and a half years, most of them have been in camps or roaming about homeless, hopeless and full of bitterness. The great mass of human misery in the refugee area cries out for the demonstration of the Gospel in practice.

The Beirut Conference in May 1951 met to discuss this question, and brought Churches and missions together under the auspices of the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council. This meeting helped in making it clear to the Christians and non-Christians of that area that the Churches of the West are not at one with the states of the West in the injustice done to the Palestinian refugees.

From the problems mentioned above we see that there lies buried in the hearts of the peoples of the Near East more fear, more frustration, and more hatred than has been found even in this troubled part of the world at any time since the end of the Crusades. All this is at the historic cross-roads of the world and at a critical period of world history. The greatest proof of the existence of this bewilderment and confusion is that two states—Syria and Egypt—have done away with their old inefficient governments and monarchs: and the third state, Lebanon, is very anxious to do so.¹ The reason they have done this is their discontent with their present condition—they are looking for the better life. And there lies the great opportunity for the Christian Church to present Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life.

II. The fact that I should like to emphasise with all the power I possess is that the hope and peace of the Near East lies with the Christian Church. But what kind of Church? Certainly not the type we have to-day—weak, poor, ritualistic, torn by schisms and divisions, with very little zeal for witnessing. To-day we see Nationalism, Mohammedanism, Zionism and Communism—all these rival philosophies—competing to shape the future of the Near East. But where is Christianity? Why is it dormant? Christianity has in these days the greatest opportunity to come to the front with its great message—of salvation of man and regeneration of society.

¹ A month after this address was delivered, the Lebanese nation got rid of the President and Government and elected a new one.

If the Churches of the Near East are to be active, effective, and dynamic in the life of the peoples of the Moslem world and bring to them harmony, love, reconciliation, peace and salvation, they (the Churches) must become *missionary* and *united*. And there ring the bells of the two world conferences of the International Missionary Council at Willingen, and this Conference on Faith and Order at Lund: *Calling the Churches to Mission and Unity*. This calling must be taken very seriously.

First, *the Church must be missionary*.

It does not suffice to have worshipping churches (however beautiful and attractive the worship services might be). The world needs witnessing churches that would witness boldly and attractively with love and power to the truth in Christ as the Saviour of all men and the Lord of all life. The Church is called to exercise a ministry of reconciliation and interpretation: reconciliation between the peoples of the Near East themselves, between Arabs and Jews, and between the West and the East; interpretation in a wholesome manner of the West to the East.

Secondly, if the Christian Church is to win the peoples of the Near East to Christ, *she has to be one—she must be united*. Do tell me, Fathers and Leaders of the Church of Christ assembled in this historic conference: How can a Church that is not itself at peace, bring peace to countries torn by hatred, suspicion, fighting and wars? How can we expect men to believe our claim that the Church can bridge divisions in human society, when it is itself divided? How can we say that in Christ is the secret of unity and reconciliation, when His Church is divided?

Unity is needed for the sake of efficient Christian service and avoiding overlapping of work and unnecessary expense. Again, we need unity because our present divisions are partly holding up progress in evangelism in the mission field. And this is a great sin. This is what made the man of God, the great Indian Christian leader, the late Bishop Azariah, say: 'Reunion might be important in the West, but it is a matter of life and death for Christianity in the East.' The same Bishop told the Edinburgh Conference of 1910 that he was approached by the leaders of a Hindu community who said they were greatly attracted by the Christian faith. But they said: 'In Hinduism we are one; in Christianity we shall be divided. So we hesitate.' And the Bishop exclaimed:

‘What was I to say to them?’ This criticism of Christianity is being repeated by the Moslems very frequently. What are we to say to them? As we heard from Professor Schlink last evening: ‘We shall give account for all this in the day of judgment’.

These circumstances are forcing the Younger Churches—as Dr. Schlink also mentioned in his prophetic address—‘. . . to leave their historical traditions behind and strive towards unity, as it corresponds with the One Lord’.

We give praise to God for the church unions that have taken place in the East in recent years since Edinburgh, 1937, as described by Bishop Stephen Neill in his book, *Towards Church Union*. I heard Sarah Chakko say in an address she gave a few months ago in Beirut: ‘After the church union in South India, the Church has been witnessing in a way that we have never known before.’

We also thank God for the movements for Christian unity and fellowship that are taking place in certain areas of the Near East. In Egypt there is the Fellowship of Unity in which all the Christian Churches are represented. In Lebanon there is the Christian Youth Federation, a laymen’s movement in which all the Christian Churches are represented. Last January, this Federation held a great meeting during the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity. Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox and Protestant speakers delivered addresses on the unity of the Christian Church. Five months ago, a great conference of the heads of all the Christian Churches—cardinals, patriarchs, bishops and clergy—was held in Beirut to maintain the rights of Christians in view of the ninety days’ strike of 800 lawyers to decrease the power of the church courts. A similar conference was held in Damascus to protest against an article in the Constitution of the Syrian Republic which states that Islam is the religion of the state, and against the government’s restrictions on Christian schools. Owing to this united front, Christians were successful in both conferences.

The Evangelical Churches in Lebanon and Syria form what is now called ‘The Supreme Council of the Evangelical Churches in Lebanon and Syria’. There are twelve denominations represented on it, but they are all known by the government and the public as ‘The Evangelical Church’. In ordination services, the clergy of these denominations participate in the laying on of hands. On the second Sunday of January of each year, we

have in Beirut intercommunion and intercelebration of Holy Communion of all the Evangelical Churches, and in six languages. About one thousand people participate in the Lord's Supper. This we have been doing without much theological discussion. We just feel we are one, and it is the natural thing for the followers of Christ to do, and it is the will of our Lord and Saviour.

The National Evangelical Church of Beirut, to which I minister, does not profess allegiance to any denomination. Since its foundation in 1848, it has been rendering service to all Protestants. About 45 per cent. of its present members are Presbyterians, 20 per cent. Congregational, 15 per cent. Episcopalian, 10 per cent. Lutherans, 10 per cent. Friends, Church of God, Brethren. These communicant members, who number 1,500, form one Evangelical Church, participate in the same Lord's Supper and worship together.

I understand that there are 2,000 such non-sectarian community churches in the United States who profess allegiance to no denomination whatever but seek to integrate their activities into the community life of the cities in which they are situated. It is the great delay in our unity schemes and the urgency of these critical times that is pushing these local churches of different denominations to be merged into a non-denominational entity.

In the words of Mr. S. A. Morrison of Egypt: 'The problems of the Near East are too great for one Church to attempt to solve them alone. In the Near East there is unprecedented opportunity for the three main sections of the Christian Church (Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Protestant) to carry on an "ecumenical conversation" and to share in practical Christian service.'

In his letter to Cranmer, Calvin wrote the following words: 'Among the greatest evils of our time must be counted the fact that the Churches are so disunited. So far as I am concerned, if I can do anything to help, I shall not hesitate to cross ten oceans to serve this cause.' Most of the delegates of this conference have actually crossed many oceans in order to serve this cause of the unity of the Christian Church.

My vision of the Church that is to be, the Church of my dreams and your dreams, the coming Church I crave and you crave, will have:

The steadiness and devotion to the Bible and the emphasis on the sovereignty of God of the Presbyterian Church.

The emphasis on justification by faith, and careful nurture of the Lutheran Church.

The sense of history and the solidarity of the centuries and good taste of the Episcopal Church.

The democracy and adventurous mood of the Congregational Church.

The enthusiastic zeal, and warm heart, and the world parish of the Methodist Church.

The simplicity and love of freedom of the Baptist Church.

The heroism and steadfastness of the Eastern Orthodox Churches.

The efficient organisation and spirit of obedience of the Roman Catholic Church.

The evangelistic energy of the Disciples Church.

The concern for unfortunates of the Salvation Army.

The missionary enthusiasm of the Moravian Church.

The conception of the Church of God: that you do not join a church, but that you come into it by new birth.

The quietude of spirit, and social sympathy, and emphasis on the Inner Light and the immediacy of God of the Society of Friends.

The whole Church would be vastly enriched if all these accents were the common property of all the Christian Churches, rather than the trade mark of sectarianism. Most of these denominations grew out of some rediscovery of neglected truth or neglected emphasis.

This is the Church of my dreams and yours. For this glorious Church of to-morrow this great Conference on Faith and Order meets, works, and prays. For this *united* and *witnessing* Church, our Saviour prayed in Jerusalem 'that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee, that they all may be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me'.

The following statement from the International Missionary Council (Enlarged Committee, meeting at Willingen, Germany, in July 1952) was communicated at their request to the Faith and Order Conference at Lund, being distributed at the end of the meeting to all those present.

THE CALLING OF THE CHURCH TO
MISSION AND UNITY

The calling of the Church to mission and unity issues from the nature of God Himself, made known to us in the whole biblical revelation of the work and purpose of God in Christ. God has made of one blood all nations of men. In Christ we see God's redemptive action; in Christ God is still at work reconciling all things to Himself in one restored humanity. Christ called His apostles that they might be one with Him and with one another, and that He might send them forth, to share with Him His mission for the redemption of the world. The calling of the Church is to be one family in Him and to make known to the whole world, in word and deed, His Gospel of the Kingdom. Christ prayed for His disciples that they might be one in Him, as He and the Father are one, that the world might believe that the Father had sent Him.

The love of God in Christ calls for the threefold response of worship, unity and mission. These three aspects of the Church's response are interdependent; they become corrupted when isolated from each other. Division in the Church distorts its witness, frustrates its mission, and contradicts its own nature. If the Church is to demonstrate the Gospel in its life as well as in its preaching, it must manifest to the world the power of God to break down all barriers and to establish the Church's unity in Christ. *Christ is not divided.*

It is true that there are differences among us due to the various gifts and workings of the Holy Spirit within the one fellowship. But there are also differences among us which disrupt the Body of Christ, and separate us from one another. They spring from trusting in something other than the Cross of Christ.

We believe that through the ecumenical movement God is drawing His people together in order that He may enable us to discern yet more clearly the contradictions in our message and the barriers to unity which are also hindrances to effective witness in a divided world. We can no longer be content to accept our divisions as normal. We believe that in the ecumenical movement God has provided a way of co-operation in witness and service, and also a means for the removal of much that mars such witness and service.

We therefore recommend that National Christian Councils should consider afresh their responsibility in relation to the cause of Christian unity within their own areas. It is not the purpose of the ecumenical movement to set up an ecclesiastical super-structure, and action in matters of faith and order must remain the responsibility of the Churches. Nevertheless, within the co-operative activity of such bodies as Christian Councils the disunity of the Churches continues to hinder the fulfilment of the Church's mission.

We further recommend that the member Councils of the I.M.C. should consider fresh ways of relating their experience and concern for unity to the deliberations and actions of the Churches within their membership, and to the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches.

We further believe that God is calling us to seek every opportunity of fellowship with those Christians who are not members of the International Missionary Council and its constituent bodies. It is our earnest prayer that God will bring us together in mutual love and understanding and that we may serve as fellow-labourers in making Christ known as the Saviour of the world.

CHAPTER 7

FIRST FRUITS OF COMMON WORK



By the week-end in the middle of its course, the conference as a whole was ready to hear something of the work which had been done by its members sub-divided into committees and sections. The principal matter under committee discussion was the future organisation of Faith and Order in its new relationship to the World Council of Churches. The sections had been working towards the final report. Both aspects engaged plenary sessions of the conference, the former on Saturday, August 23rd, the latter on Monday, August 25th.

Morning plenary session, Saturday, August 23rd

Before the business began, Dr. Flew introduced to the conference Dr. George W. Richards, who had to leave before the end. Dr. Flew's tribute emphasised that in the dark days of 1939-41 Dr. Richards had gathered together a select band of theologians, the results of whose labours had been published in 1945 in a book which had been incorporated almost entire in the volume of essays on *The Church*. His work had also contributed to the union of two large Churches in the U.S.A. into the Evangelical and Reformed Church. Those two achievements alone represented something of which any man might be modestly proud.

The conference greeted Dr. Richards, and then proceeded to business. The following memorandum had been circulated as an advance document to all delegates, and had formed the agenda of the Committee on Future Organisation (for membership, see Appendix IV, pp. 349-50).

AFTER LUND

PROPOSALS

The following statement of the function and organisation of the Commission on Faith and Order in the period after the Lund Conference was approved by a joint consultation between representatives

of the Executive Committees of Faith and Order and of the Central Committee.

Functions

(a) To proclaim the essential oneness of the Church of Christ and to keep prominently before the World Council and the Churches the obligation to manifest that unity.

(b) To study questions of doctrine and worship, and other problems, in their bearing on the unity of the Church.

(c) To study the theological implications of the existence of the ecumenical movement.

(d) To study matters in the present relationships of the Churches to one another which cause difficulties and need theological clarification.

(e) To provide information concerning actual steps taken by the Churches towards reunion.

Organisation

(i) World Conferences on Faith and Order are to be held when main subjects are ready for submission to the Churches, and when, on recommendation of the Commission on Faith and Order, the Central Committee so decides.

(ii) The Commission on Faith and Order shall consist of 80 members nominated to the Central Committee by the Lund Conference with power to nominate additional members up to the number of 20, all these to hold office until the next Assembly of the World Council at which the list of membership shall be revised on the basis of nominations made by the Commission.

(iii) The Commission shall meet normally every three years but may be called together at any time when major theological commission reports need to be reviewed by a larger body than the Working Committee.

(iv) The Commission shall nominate, for appointment by the Central Committee, a Working Committee of about 25 members. The Working Committee shall normally meet annually and shall be responsible (a) for administration, (b) for directing the study work and other activities of Faith and Order, and (c) for co-operation with other agencies such as the Study Department of the World Council.

(v) There shall be various theological commissions on special topics set up by the Commission or Working Committee. Membership of these theological commissions need not be confined to membership of the Commission or Working Committee.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM (by the Theological Secretary)

i

In 1937, when the independent Life and Work and Faith and Order movements decided to get married and give birth to the World Council of Churches, it was confidently expected that a few years would see the union consummated and the old parents settled in their offspring's home. Had everything gone straight forward as intended, the programme of the two movements might have been satisfactorily co-ordinated from the start. But fate decreed otherwise. By 1946, when it became possible to make definite plans for summoning the first World Council Assembly to meet in 1948, the Faith and Order Continuation Committee appointed at Edinburgh was so fully engaged in the enquiries there charged upon it that it could not turn aside to work on other lines in preparation for Amsterdam. It was therefore necessary for the Study Department to take charge of the whole of that preparation, and the result has been a certain amount of overlapping and duplication in the use of the World Council's resources for study and research. Lund and Evanston, taken together, will be the first opportunity for tidying up this confused situation. The Faith and Order Commission is engaged on preparation for Lund, the Study Department on preparation for Evanston. Each in turn will start with a clean sheet. Now is the time to consider what in future is to be their relation to one another.

If we ask what pattern is to be drawn on the post-Lund-Evanston sheet, it helps to see that ecumenical study as a whole includes:

A. What may be called joint research work, aiming at the publication of results which will register the stage reached in the thought of Christendom on subjects which concern the Churches. Such subjects may be theological or moral or arising in connection with politics, sociology, missionary strategy, or otherwise. An example of the kind of contribution that can be made in the field of theology is the statement on *Guiding Principles for the Interpretation of the Bible* issued in 1949.

B. The exploration of the theological differences which underlie the divisions of Christendom with a view to enabling the Churches to grow in mutual understanding and take steps towards their reconciliation.

This latter task is that which its own traditions assign to the Commission on Faith and Order. To it a second task has been added in the constitution drawn up at the time of the formation of the World Council: to keep constantly before the Churches their duty to be content with nothing less than a fully united Christendom, and to keep them informed of whatever actual steps are being taken towards that end.

ii

Is it possible to arrive at a clear understanding of principle on which to base a division of labour between the Commission on Faith and Order and the Study Department?

The specific task of the Faith and Order Commission is the study of the issues underlying the divisions of Christendom. I say 'underlying', because it may often be found necessary to study fundamental theological questions which have implications for denominational divisions that are not immediately obvious, questions on which there are differences between theologians which do not follow denominational lines. Instances of what I mean are subjects such as the nature of the Church's continuity, and the right understanding of eschatology. Besides the theological questions which either immediately cause or underlie divisions there are non-theological factors which must be taken into account. The aim of the study throughout is to help the Churches to discover how far their views of one another are clouded by misunderstanding, to expose genuine differences of conviction, to explore the possibility of their reconciliation to the extent of being able to co-exist in one Church.

This seems to me to give a clear indication of the lines on which an intelligible and workable division of labour can be carried out. The Faith and Order Commission is not to be regarded as belonging to a research bureau to which the Churches may turn for information on the trend of ecumenical thought on this or that theological subject. That is the responsibility of the Study Department. For the effective prosecution of its work that Department must of necessity keep more in the centre of the ecumenical stage, organising study groups and study conferences on various subjects in various parts of the world, widely circulating drafts for comment and criticism, publishing literature which will keep all Christendom in touch with the progress of its work. Meanwhile, so far as much of its work is concerned, the Faith and Order Commission must be content to keep out of the limelight, to be 'back-room boys' worrying away at the issues which keep the Churches apart, not aiming so much at the publication of results as at submitting to the Churches material which may help them to grow towards mutual understanding and unity.

In this connection I cannot refrain from quoting an extract from what I wrote as secretary of the independent Faith and Order movement in 1933:

'Faith and Order is, so to speak, a movement created in order to perish. This may not be true of some other movements. The Stockholm Movement, for example, may reasonably believe that a

reunited Christendom will still require an organ for studying the practical application of Christian principles to the problem of life and work. But with that final reconciliation of disagreements for which we work and pray, the Lausanne Movement will first sing *Laus Deo* and then *Nunc Dimittis*' (Faith and Order Paper, No. 70, p. 12).

iii

'History', it has been said, 'repeats itself.' I am inclined to think that this maxim may give us the clue to what needs to be done in 1952 and 1954. In 1937 Life and Work and Faith and Order united to produce a *tertium quid* which should take both under its wing and provide for the carrying on of their work. My suggestion is that at Evanston in 1954 the Assembly shall establish an over-arching *tertium quid* to include and co-ordinate the Study Department and the Commission on Faith and Order, and that the steps taken at Lund shall be such as to provide a Commission which will fit into this organisation.

I think myself that this arrangement will be carrying out the intention of the Edinburgh Conference. In 1937 Faith and Order and Life and Work were both organisations mainly engaged in study. The Edinburgh Conference thought of the World Council as formed to co-ordinate their studies. The outbreak of war, with the resulting need of care for prisoners and refugees, and other such demands, have led to the World Council becoming a body with much wider responsibilities, a body which *does* things, in which its Study Department is simply one element in the whole. That Department and the Faith and Order Commission are unco-ordinated, as Life and Work and Faith and Order were unco-ordinated in 1937. My suggestion is that the outstanding problem be now dealt with on the lines which were then agreed upon.

Within this new 'Research and Study Bureau' (or whatever it may be called) its two divisions could each carry on with its own work, and a clear understanding of the tasks and responsibilities of each would make co-operation a natural consequence. If, in the course of its researches, the Study Department should unearth a ground of inter-church division, it would bring it to the notice of the Faith and Order Commission, not with a view to asking the Commission to take over part of the Department's work, but as grist for its own mill. If, in the course of its own studies, the Commission should think it had made some discovery likely to be of interest and importance to the Department, it would pass it on. The organisation of the overarching 'bureau' need not consist of more than a small liaison committee, which would see to it that each knew what the other was doing, would arrange for

the settlement of any questions that might arise between them, and be the body to discuss in the first instance whether material provided by either Department or Commission should be brought before the Churches through (a) immediate publication, (b) the Assembly, or (c) a special Conference.

This memorandum is concerned with matters which do not concern the Commission on Faith and Order alone, but will have to be worked out in conjunction with the World Council's Re-appraisal Committee. The proposals to be brought forward at Lund have been framed in such a way as to fit in with plans for the general reorganisation of the World Council's study work which are to be laid before the Evanston Assembly in 1954.

The Chairman of the Committee on Future Organisation introduced its report.

PROFESSOR BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL (Netherlands Reformed Church): I am very glad to be standing here to present to the conference the report of this committee, and especially because we have been working hard in three sections to complete it and have only just finished our work. We were glad that veterans of the World Council's Committee on Structure and Functioning were present with us. You will all be prepared for this morning's debate because you will have in your hands the minutes of the last meeting of the Executive Committee, and the memorandum produced at that time by Dr. Hodgson. Those of you who are specialised in matters of functioning will also have the Constitution as it was fixed at Baarn in 1948. There were many things in that constitution to be changed as a result of our discussions, and three members of the committee have prepared a list which is now in your hands of the changes we propose.

You will now see how impossible it is for a Dutchman to speak in English about such matters, and so I now think that Dr. Hodgson will introduce our report to you.

DR. HODGSON explained that their report had two characteristics—it was a unanimous report, and was quite unintelligible. The latter characteristic was due to the form the report had to take—that of a recommendation of amendments to the present Constitution. He continued:

Until 1948 the old independent Faith and Order movement never had any written constitution. We lived by custom and

precedent, and I think we got on well without it; but when we became part of the World Council it was necessary that the thing should be put down and codified, in order to define the place of Faith and Order in the united movement. The first meeting of the Faith and Order Commission at Baarn drew up this constitution, which codified the then existing practice, and it was then submitted to the World Council's Central Committee for approval. It is by that constitution that we are governed, and the only way in which we can make the adjustments which the experience of the last four or five years shows to be desirable is to go again to the Central Committee and submit the necessary changes for its approval. That is why the report is in this form. My task is to try to make it intelligible.

We have to make such adjustments as are necessary for the good of the future of the World Council. That has been under discussion at Clarens and Lambeth, and the document which has been circulated to you gives the recommendations of the Executive Committee agreed upon last February after consultation with other relevant agencies of the World Council. The first thing our committee has done has been to look again at those recommendations, and my first point is that they are all embodied practically as they came to us, with one or two minor points of adjustment. After we had agreed to recommend the adoption of these recommendations from the Executive Committee, we saw that there were one or two outstanding points which had not there been dealt with, for example, the vice-chairmanship. In the old independent days of Faith and Order it was desirable to have as widespread a group of countries and Churches as possible represented on the presiding board. Our committee this week felt that that function is now fulfilled by the World Council, and that it was no longer necessary for the Faith and Order Commission to have more than one vice-chairman.

Dr. Hodgson then expounded a paper which was a commentary upon the Constitution; but since the Constitution, as finally adopted, is printed in Appendix 6 on pp. 359-65 of this volume, it is unnecessary to record here all the details of the exposition. It will suffice, for purposes of this chronicle, to indicate some of the points made in the debate.

DEAN S. J. ENGLAND (Disciples of Christ, U.S.A.) proposed that § 3 (ii) should be amended to read as follows:

3 (ii) To study the social, cultural, political and other apparently non-theological factors which affect the actual relationships of the Churches to one another, whether these factors cause difficulties or bring the Churches closer together, and to consider the theological implications of these factors for their bearing on the movement toward the unity of the Church.

DR. D. D. WILLIAMS (Congregational Christian Churches, U.S.A.) suggested that this paragraph might be amended to read:

3 (ii) To study questions of doctrine, of worship and of the influence of social and cultural factors in their bearing on the unity of the Church.

He was ready to support Dean England's amendment, or his own if it was any simpler, in order to make clear in the constitution that Faith and Order explicitly committed itself to the study of this area of its problem.

The President asked whether Dean England would be prepared to accept the shorter version. Dean England said he would accept it, and seconded Dr. Williams' formal motion for the incorporation of these words in § 3 (ii).

PROFESSOR R. R. HARTFORD (Church of Ireland) declared that he had seldom sat on a more fair-minded committee, more animated by the desire to reach a conclusion satisfactory to all concerned. It was because he believed that such a solution had been found that he commended the proposals introduced by Dr. Hodgson. Undoubtedly there were members of the Faith and Order movement who were somewhat nervous at the decision to re-write the Constitution, and he admitted that he was one of those who had been educated into believing such a re-writing to be necessary. The spirit in which constitutions were written mattered more than the constitutions themselves, and the future development of the movement would provide evidence of the way in which their present decisions would be interpreted. They knew that there were still Christians who loved the Faith and Order movement but who had not yet fallen in love with the World Council, and they hoped that particular dichotomy of loving would disappear. In one sense the Faith and Order movement must always be a slow movement: if the Churches had been growing apart for a thousand years, was it surprising that they

had made so little progress in twenty-five years? Yet in another sense it was not a slow movement, but had accomplished things which could not have happened fifty years ago.

They still had the task of explaining themselves to themselves. As an Anglican, he was often disappointed at the witness of Anglicans in ecumenical conferences; they had not explained Anglicanism to their brethren in the other Churches. They had left the impression that they were so divided amongst themselves as to have nothing useful to offer to the ecumenical movement. But that was entirely false. There was complete unity in their communion, and it was because of that that they could remain one communion and still manifest what to outsiders seemed to be absolutely impossible diversity of practice. It was here that they had most to contribute to the ecumenical movement.

He believed that this explaining of themselves to themselves could best be done in smaller conferences, rather than in world conferences at regular intervals.

MR. C. T. LEQUESNE, Q.C. (Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland) asked for a clarification of the relationship between World Council Assemblies and Faith and Order World Conferences.

DR. HODGSON explained that in the old days a World Conference on Faith and Order, consisting of delegates directly appointed by the Churches to represent them, was the governing body of the movement. World Council Assemblies could now fulfil the old function of World Conferences. However, the committee felt that if, between Assemblies, it should be thought right to hold a World Conference on Faith and Order subjects, such a conference ought to have the kind of revising authority for its Commission that such conferences had always had in the past. The problem was how to combine provision for revision of membership at regular intervals of five years at Assemblies with the powers of a conference called on Faith and Order. The committee thought that a solution had been found by providing for such a conference to have the right to advise a revision, though not necessarily a complete change of membership.

DR. BOEN-GIOK POWW (Chinese Reformed Church in West Java) at this point spoke of the importance of enabling the younger Churches to participate in the work of such conferences. He pointed out that some of the younger Churches which would

like to become members of the World Council were unable to make the necessary financial contribution, and hoped that the World Council would make it possible for them to be represented at its more important conferences.

DR. E. C. BLAKE (Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.) made four points:

(1) The proposed § 5 (ii) of the Constitution did not require the members of the Faith and Order Commission to be members of the World Council Assembly which appointed them. In view of this, he hoped an insertion about obtaining the approval of the Churches concerned for such appointments would be made.

(2) Some indication should be given of the basis of the choice of Commission members, by adding some such phrase as 'in a just distribution on the basis of confession, church membership, and geographical location'.

(3) The existing paragraph provided that as high a proportion as one-fifth of the Commission should be made up of co-opted members. There was clearly a need to provide for the addition of specialists, but such a proportion could change the whole character of the body, and he thought that 90 or 85 of the total membership of 100 should be appointed.

(4) Regarding § 5 (v), the approval of their Churches ought also to be required for the appointment of members of theological commissions.

DR. HODGSON replied to Dr. Blake's points:

(1) Regarding the appointment of the members of the Faith and Order Commission, they had definitely not said that the Commission must be appointed from the membership of the Assembly. It had always been customary in Faith and Order to make some of their members people who were not at the conference, but were representatives of Churches who could not be present. Regarding this question of the need of approval by the Churches, every World Council Assembly consisted of delegations specially commissioned by their Church to represent it. That being so, those delegations could be trusted not to appoint to a Commission on Faith and Order any persons whose appointment would not be welcomed by the Churches who had constituted the Assembly by sending delegations. The appointment of members by the Assembly was on a different footing from the Commission's recommendations for co-opting members or for

filling vacancies. In the latter case the approval of the Church to which the person belonged was necessary. The Secretary in such cases communicated with the responsible officers of the Church concerned, men who knew what members could be trusted to represent their Church. This procedure had worked in the past, but was difficult to formulate.

(2) The proportion of co-opted members was a matter on which members of the conference might wish to express their opinions. It had not been intended to fill all 20 places at once with co-opted members, but to leave some of them open, which might be useful as the Commission pursued its work. However the conference might prefer to have, e.g., 85 nominated members instead of 80.

DR. L. E. COOKE (Congregational Union of England and Wales) explained the origin of the proposed term 'Working Committee'. The World Council Committee on Structure and Functioning had coined the phrase 'Working Committee' to describe departmental executive committees, to avoid confusion with the Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches itself.

After further contributions by Bishop A. J. Allen (African Methodist Episcopal Church, U.S.A.), Prebendary A. J. Macdonald (Church of England), the Rev. A. W. Applegate (Five Years Meeting of Friends, U.S.A.), Bishop D. W. Nichols (African Methodist Episcopal Church, U.S.A.) and Mr. E. Hayman (Church of England), it was agreed that the report should be referred back to the committee for the consideration of the proposals which had been made. The final debate, leading to the adoption of the Constitution, (as printed in Appendix 6 on pp. 359-65) took place on Monday 25th August.

Receiving of Draft Reports, Monday, August 25th

As a result of whirlwind activity behind the scenes, draft reports of all Sections were available for delegates by the late afternoon of Saturday the 23rd, and French and German translations shortly afterwards. Thus they could be studied a little in the scant leisure of the week-end, and they were introduced and discussed at the plenary sessions on the morning and afternoon of Monday, August 25th.

The full text of these first drafts is printed below, since a

comparison between these texts and the final version, embodied in the Report printed as Part I of this volume, throws light upon the way in which the conference moved from its first thoughts to its final statement.

Since much of the debate was concerned with verbal amendments which it would be impossible to follow here without constant reference to the text of the draft reports, only those contributions from the floor of the house are recorded in this report which are comprehensible without reference to a particular line or word in the drafts.

REPORT OF FIRST SECTION ON THE CHURCH

The President explained that as Dr. Dawley, the chairman of Section I, had been taken ill, the report of that section would be dealt with by Dr. Cragg.

DR. G. R. CRAGG (United Church of Canada) presented the report of Section I. He pointed out that, since the German text needed amendment and revision, the English text should be taken as the basis for discussion. He explained that, although Part I of the report had been prepared by a sub-committee, and Part II by the remainder of the section, the whole report had nevertheless been approved by the section as a whole.

PART I. CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH

We believe in Jesus Christ our Lord, who loved the Church and gave Himself for it, and has brought the Church into an abiding union with Himself. Because we believe in Jesus Christ we believe also in the Church and know it as the Body of Christ.

I

We confess that without Christ we are lost, and without Him we are subject to the powers of sin and death, but that God has not abandoned us to the powers of destruction. He has given us His only begotten Son as Saviour and Redeemer. Through His life, His suffering, His death and His resurrection Jesus Christ as the mighty Victor has overcome sin and death, brought the ungodly powers to nought, and has given us freedom. When we believe in Jesus Christ these powers can no longer exercise lordship over us. We stand under a new Lord. It is Jesus Christ who is our Lord. Through Him God has given

to lost humanity a new beginning, for in that Jesus Christ died and rose again, all who believe in Him die and rise again to a new life.

Jesus Christ is the King of the new People of God. He is the chief cornerstone in whom the whole building grows up into a holy temple in the Lord. He is the Head of the Church which is His Body. Through His spirit Jesus Christ Himself is present in His Church. Christ lives in His Church and the Church lives in Christ. Christ is never without His Church; the Church is never without Christ. Both belong inseparably together, the King and His people, the keystone and the temple, the Head and the Body. As members of His Body we are made one with Him in the fellowship of His life, death and resurrection, of His suffering and His glory. For what concerns Christ concerns His Body also. What has happened to Christ on behalf of the Church happens to His Church also. The way of Christ is the way of His Church.

II

The following paragraphs seek to penetrate behind the divisions of the Church on earth to faith in the one Lord, in order that from the way of Christ with His Church we may understand the way of the Church on earth in union with Christ, and from the unity of Christ and His Body we may seek a means of realising that unity in the actual state of our divisions on earth.

1. God's eternal Son has come to redeem creation from sin and death. He became man, by word and deed proclaimed on earth the arrival of God's Kingdom, bore away the sins of the world on the cross, rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven and inaugurated His Kingdom at the right hand of God. As Lord and King He will come again to judge the quick and the dead and to consummate the eternal Kingdom of God in the whole creation.

2. (a) The Lord Jesus Christ, through His Word and Spirit, calls His Church out of the world. He forgives sins, delivers men from the lordship of the powers of destruction and gathers out of this broken world the one People of God, the community of the justified and sanctified whose citizenship is in heaven and whose life is hid with Christ in God.

(b) Jesus Christ through His Word and Spirit sends His Church back into the world to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world. That is, as Prophet, Priest and King He gives His Church to participate in His ministry of reconciliation, constraining it by His love to enter into His passion for the redemption of the world, and empowering it by His spirit to proclaim the Gospel of Salvation to all nations, calling them to obey the will of God in all the areas of political and social and

cultural life and to live out in the divisions of the world the life of the one People of God, so that through its witness Jesus Christ is at work among men as Saviour, and brings all things in subjection under Himself as Lord and King of the world.

(c) By calling and sending His People, by granting them manifold spiritual gifts for the ministry, Jesus Christ builds up His Church as the living Temple of God. Thus the Church as the Body of Christ "grows up into him in all things who is the head, from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth according to the effective working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

3. (a) At the same time the Church is a community of sinners waiting for the final consummation of its redemption, and continues to be a Pilgrim People in a strange land, so that all its life and work on earth is incomplete. Ungodly powers and forces are still rampant in the whole creation in an alarming way, and they seek to confuse the Church and cause it to suffer.

(b) At the end of the Church's pilgrimage stands Jesus Christ, the Crucified and Risen, who will come again for final redemption and judgment. Out of all peoples and ages He will gather His own who look for His appearing and for a new heaven and a new earth, and in a great Marriage Supper of the Lamb He will consummate the union between Christ and His Church in the eternal Kingdom of God.

(c) Through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit the new age of the future is already present, and through union with the risen Jesus Christ the Church on earth is already given to participate in the power of the resurrection. The Church of Jesus Christ in history is at once the congregation of sinners and the new creation, for although it continues to live and work within the brokenness and estrangement of this world and to share in its divisions, the Church belongs essentially to the new age and the new creation. As such the Church is summoned to perpetual renewal, to put off the old life, and by the renewal of its mind to be conformed to Christ, looking beyond its historical forms to the full unveiling of its new being in the coming Lord.

III

We have sought to declare in these brief paragraphs the inseparable relationship between Christ and His Church. To these affirmations about the Church we are all committed by our shared acceptance of the authority of the Holy Scriptures. We cannot build the one Church by cleverly fitting together our divided inheritances. We can grow

together towards fulness and unity in Christ only by being conformed to Him who is the Head of the Body and the Lord of His people. And He manifests His fulness, however brokenly, in the gifts He has given to us even in our separations. Wherever two or three are gathered in His name He is in the midst of them. Wherever men are met in obedience to His word, He is to be acknowledged. He is to be found in the midst of those from whom we withdraw.

When we place ourselves in our Churches under His judgment and in obedience to His calling and His sending, we shall know that we cannot manifest our unity and share in His fulness without being changed. Some of us who have been assured that we possess the true order and the true sacraments will find ourselves called to give its rightful place to the preaching of the living word. Some who have neglected the sacraments will be confronted by Him who humbled Himself in baptism and broke bread and shared the cup to make us partakers of His passion and death. Those who have sought to show forth the glory of the Church as the Body and Bride of Christ must stand under the judgment of His simplicity and servanthood. Churches which have valued little His prayer that the oneness of His people be made manifest to men will be summoned to make His prayer their own. Churches complacent in the face of racial divisions in the Body will be brought to repentance by Him in whom bond and free, Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian are one. Churches which have stressed one-sidedly that God in His Church gives Himself to men will be reminded that Christ in His humanity offered Himself to the Father. Those who are ever looking backward and have accumulated much precious ecclesiastical baggage will perhaps be shown that pilgrims must travel light and that, if we are to share at the last in the great supper, we must let go much that we treasure. Churches settled and self-assured will have to hear again the Lord's heartbroken concern for the sheep without a shepherd and know that to be His Church is to share in His world-embracing mission. Churches too much at home in the world will hear themselves called out of the world. Churches too wrapped up in their own piety or their own survival will see again Him who identified Himself with the deprived and the oppressed.

We cannot know all that shall be disclosed to us, when together we look to Him who is the Head of the Body. It is easy for us in our several Churches to think of what our separated brethren need to learn. Christ's love will make us more ready to learn what He can teach us through them. The truth we would hold fast is that, because Christ is the Head and Lord of the Church, His way is the Church's way. He calls, He sends, He judges. The shape of His life is the shape of the Church's life. The mystery of His life is the mystery of the Church's life.

PART II

I

We confess our faith in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church that is God's gift for the salvation of the world. The saving acts of God in Christ brought the Church into being, and it persists in continuity in history by the presence and power of the Holy Spirit.

The Church's vocation is to glorify God in adoration and sacrificial service, bearing witness in its corporate life to God's redeeming grace in Jesus Christ, proclaiming the good news to every creature, making disciples of all nations, and bringing Christ's commandments to communities as well as individuals.

We make these affirmations in the context of an underlying unity of life in Christ. Christ has made us His own and He is not divided. In seeking Him we find one another, and we humbly and gratefully acknowledge this unity as given of God. It enables us to face our divisions penitently, and under the continued guidance of the Holy Spirit we resolve to seek new ways of approach to each other.

Discussion reveals serious differences concerning the beliefs held by or within some of the Churches about the limits of the Church and the mode of its definition. Although the examination of these differences in the preparatory work of the Theological Commission and in the experience of personal encounter reveals an encouraging degree of common ground, the sharpest points of divergence seem now to yield reluctantly in this method of approach to one another.

Part of the difficulty is that the language which expresses our understanding of the faith is sometimes an inadequate means of communicating our convictions one to another. We may discover that some of this language embodies insights which in the divisions of the Church have become isolated from the wholeness of Christian truth. Often particular emphases become focal points from which denominational life is not easily freed. It is in ecumenical meeting that we are made aware of a wholeness that must both include and complete the faith and life of the separated members of God's family. Here we are faced with the dilemma of a proper confessional loyalty and obedience to the richer unity of the One Church to which the Faith and Order movement points us.

II

Conscious and deliberate theological work is always one important line of advance, as the Report of the Theological Commission on the Church states. Recent research in the sphere of biblical exegesis has brought new theological tasks, the undertaking of which may bring

new light into our disagreements. But at the same time there are other elements in our situation that need attention. Various factors operative among us call the Churches to careful self-examination. We suggest serious consideration of the following;

The Church lives by the once-and-for-all revelation of God in Jesus Christ at a particular point in history, but her life and work is within the continuous movement of history. The thought forms and language through which the Church proclaims the one Gospel are therefore subject to the limitations and changes of history. But the nature of any given historical period is such that in no one age can the truth of God's revelation be given full expression. This does not mean that the Church should subordinate its message to the relativities of history, for we believe that the revelation of God in Jesus Christ and the scriptural witness to it is unique and normative for all ages. The Church should seek to proclaim this truth in ever-new terms, but the language and thought forms coined in history must be constantly corrected by the content of the Gospel. This is also true of those means by which the Churches have confessed their faith in decisive moments of their history. We must always make sure in contending for our distinctive convictions that we distinguish between the confession of the truth to which we are committed and those expressions of it that were in part products of a particular age. If all denominations are prepared to do this in obedience to the Gospel alone, we may well come nearer to one another.

Furthermore, this work of interpretation takes place in an intellectual climate that has undergone far-reaching changes. Modern biblical study has had a profound influence on our understanding and interpretation of the Scriptures. Much of this biblical study cuts across denominational lines and in it all our Churches share and have a new place of meeting.

In addition, the new outlook created by the scientific age has changed the whole atmosphere in which our discussions take place. Most of our divisions antedate the emergence of this new knowledge concerning man and the universe in which he lives. This, clearly, does not affect our central convictions but it has influenced the manner in which we present them to each other. For example, modern insights into the nature of man have not changed the Christian understanding of man as sinner. In some cases it has even illuminated our understanding of man's fallen estate. This suggests at least one form of self-examination. Not only our terminology, but our spiritual and devotional practices need to be examined afresh. In so doing, as the Report of the Commission on Ways of Worship suggests, Christians of widely differing traditions may find new points of agreement.

III

The Gospel is always received by men living within certain particular situations—cultural, social, political and economic. In these conditions Christians embody their allegiance to God. The Church, constantly renewed and sustained by God's saving activity, lives in history and fulfils its mission under the manifold pressure of man's finite and sinful life. It stands on the frontier between the Word and the world, constantly tempted by the motives of a society that seeks to organise and preserve itself apart from God. Many of our presuppositions and prejudices, usually unconscious and unavowed, are the outcome of worldly pride and self-assertion. Cultural conditions are sometimes treated as essential to the Gospel. National aims are on occasion identified with God's will. Ecclesiastical customs are confused with requirements of faith. We have received patterns of thought from the structure of society which prevent us in any age from full obedience to God's Word.

The importance of these influences upon our Churches cannot be denied. They have played a part in creating our divisions; they continue to play a part in maintaining these divisions. They inhibit our understanding of the message of salvation and seriously impede the fulfilment of our mission. The Churches should examine themselves to see if some of their divisions are not rooted in or at least partly influenced by social and cultural factors.

When we seek to isolate the tensions due to these forces, we locate more readily the hidden factors among others than we do in ourselves. We are slow to undertake the painful self-scrutiny of our own situation. If we are to deal with this bravely and adequately, we must hear humbly and willingly what others say to us. God seeks to speak to each through the other and we may hear His voice only in the context of Christian brotherhood.

IV

The Church in our time is rediscovering the sense of crisis and urgency that marked the Apostolic age. In a period when persecution is again a reality, the dividing walls between Christian groups become transparent, and a new perspective on essentials and non-essentials brings a deeper unity to the people of God. When our obedience to the faith confronts the world with a strong Christian witness, suffering ceases to be a temporary emergency and becomes again a part of the normal experience of the Church. Christians who are complacent in their security are called not only to fellowship with their brethren under persecution, but to that humble self-examination which takes

account of their own shortcomings and prepares them to bear whatever burdens God's will may lay upon them.

From the younger Churches we learn a lesson of similar character. Under the constraint of the missionary imperative, they have discovered that the need of unity is fully understood only when related to the great task of evangelism. Their strong awareness of our fundamental oneness in Christ is due not merely to their relative immunity from the influences which produced and still maintain divisions among the older Churches, but also to their response to the demand for full obedience to the requirements of faithful service. In their experience we can surely see the leading of the Holy Spirit. The miracle of this unity has disclosed to the older Churches the tragic extent to which their own witness had been impaired by their separation.

Each Church must accept the problem of disunion as an inseparable part of its own responsibility of grappling with the scandal of Christian division. In such acceptance we may find a surer movement towards each other. We commend to the Churches the careful study of the report on *The Church*, prepared by the Faith and Order Commission, calling attention particularly to the special theological tasks enumerated therein. If these can be undertaken by representative groups—groups which benefit from the resources of the experts but which secure the participation of others, and which mobilise the latent forces of each Church yet also transcend denominational lines—we are convinced that new light can be shed on our disagreements.

Furthermore we believe that all Christians are called to a deeper common participation in prayer and worship, in obedience, fellowship and service. These, no less than theological discussion, are means whereby the unity of Christ in the Church is manifested and known.

The President opened the meeting for discussion on the report.

PROFESSOR G. FLOROVSKY (Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, Exarchate for Russians in the West) said that it was difficult to discuss a theological document in a plenary session. The general endeavour was to discover a common language; but no ecumenical language had yet been discovered. The language of the report was a patchwork of various theological schools, which made analysis very difficult.

(I) The report laid much emphasis on unity in Christ, but made no mention of our difficulties. Christ is God incarnate, but the Church consists of men. The tension between the divine head and the human body should therefore be brought out. He fully agreed with the reference to the Church as a congregation of

sinner: but what was the truth concerning the relation between Christ and His Church? This point was obscure. How was it that the Body of Christ *is* divided?

(2) The report gave an unbalanced presentation of the unity that is given. Christ died for all men. However, when we speak of our unity we are not speaking of this, but rather of the unity that was given to the Church when it was founded. Something relevant was said on this point in Part II of the report; the two parts needed bringing together more.

(3) Thirdly, he wished to protest against the use of the expression: 'some' think this, 'some' think that. Why not say: some traditions hold this, others that? It was a nice metaphor to say that we ought to shed some of our unnecessary luggage; the question was: *which* luggage?

He concluded by saying that the report was a very interesting theological exercise, but could they say that it represented the result of true ecumenical conversation, in which the different points of view were successfully stressed? It was true that they would not vote on it, but they would think silently about the nature of the document.

DR. R. L. CALHOUN (Congregational Christian Churches, U.S.A.) said that he thought the report was a very fine statement, especially Part II. He had some doubts about some aspects of Part I, which had less unity of impact, because of the form in which it was presented. Several paragraphs in Part I seemed to be a series of one-sided emphases rather than a forward-moving statement, and he thought the language should be made more explicit. Canon Hodgson, in his opening address, had spoken of the understanding of the relation of Christ to the Father and to the Church. We need to understand more adequately the relation of Christ to the Church and of believers to one another and to their Lord. The words of Christ, 'Ye who have seen me have seen the Father', did not mean that we no longer see the Father, but that we now know how the Father is working in the Church and the world to-day.

The Spirit at work in the Church was not to be thought of as a sort of adjunct; it was the living presence of God working in the midst of our differences and struggles, our failures and our continual hope of finding a common experience.

Secondly, the report seemed to suggest that the Church was

somehow apart from the world. The Church is in the world in the sense of a real incarnation.

Thirdly, it had to be made clear that the membership of the Church was a company of *forgiven* sinners. Even now we are participants in God's gift of grace to us. We need repentance daily, that we may be forgiven by His infinite mercy. The emphasis of the report was perhaps too metaphysical. The Church in its aspect of the New Creation was not as clear as it might have been.

PROFESSOR D. M. MACKINNON (Episcopal Church in Scotland) asked what the authors of the report had in mind when they spoke of 'the new outlook created by the scientific age'. Perhaps they meant that we must take seriously the scientific work being done to-day. But it was not clear what they meant by this new 'outlook'. Perhaps they were thinking of the way in which we could transform nature, e.g. by the atomic bomb; or perhaps of the development of certain types of mathematics which affected our understanding of the physical universe. Or perhaps they meant merely that vague sense of the broadening of the horizons which is typical of our age. Unfortunately they had not developed their reference to psychology.

The report also spoke of modern biblical studies, but some of these studies had had the effect of dividing Christians rather than uniting them. The importance of modern events could not be overlooked. Professor Hromadka's speech had been, for himself, the most challenging single utterance of the conference, but this was because Professor Hromadka had succeeded in describing the position in which he found himself in the language of the Bible; in so doing he had also given many delegates a fresh understanding of the meaning of the Acts of the Apostles. We must endeavour to express ourselves concretely and to give examples, showing how certain contemporary situations both illumined and were illumined by the Bible.

BISHOP K. RICHES (Church of England), a member of Section I, explained that Part I was an attempt to deal with the relationship of Christ and His Church and with the matters that sprang from that relationship: authority, ministry, the sacraments. It tried not merely to deal with the point at which our sharpest divisions were apparent, but to take seriously what the Bible said about the Body of Christ. The sub-committee had tried to find, behind our doctrinal differences in ecclesiology, a basic unity in

christology, for example by taking seriously the classical definition concerning the two natures of Christ and seeing how that related to the doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ. He thought this particular point could be developed much further by future study. Having passed beyond the time when the primary interest was christology, we had passed into a time when the main interest was ecclesiology. But ecclesiology alone was not enough. In Part II of the report the fact of our divisions appeared. If we took seriously the relation between christology and ecclesiology we saw that the Church could only be understood in terms of Christ as the suffering servant, as prophet, priest and king. The relation between the Corpus Christi and the congregation of sinners might be better understood if we considered what was implied in our ecclesiology. Further study should be devoted to this.

THE REV. D. T. NILES (Methodist Church in Ceylon) wondered, as he read the report, whether the relationship of the Church to the Holy Spirit had been made definitive. There seemed to be some confusion in the document between the presence of the Risen Christ in His Church and the dwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Church. There were people who seemed to suggest a belief not in the Trinity but only in two Persons. He wondered whether St. Paul, in using the expression 'the Body of Christ', really referred to the human body. Sometimes he thought that Paul was thinking of the union of husband and wife, and he thought that the metaphor should be considered in its context.

The relationship of the Church to the Father had to be considered. At the end, when Christ had subdued all His enemies, His Kingdom would come. There was a distinction between christology and ecclesiology, but a connection had to be made between the three Persons of the Trinity. He suggested that each division of Part I should have a sub-heading to make the development of thought clearer.

Mr. Niles also thought that non-theological factors had been over-emphasised. The Lord of the Church was the Lord of history, and the pressures of history were not non-theological, they were the pressure of God on the Church.

DR. J. A. JOHNSON (Coloured Methodist Episcopal Church, U.S.A.) queried whether the report was describing the Church as it was to-day or the Church as it was meant to be. Such

statements as 'The way of Christ is the way of His Church' were open to serious criticism. The Section should keep these distinctions in mind, and should indicate whether they were discussing the Church as it was or the Church as it was meant to be.

He did not like the expression 'Pilgrim People', which gave the impression of the Church as a transportation system. He believed it was the purpose of the Church to bring the people to God. Likewise, the phrase 'at the end of the Church's pilgrimage' should be reconsidered. He had the impression all along that insufficient emphasis was placed on the fact that Jesus Christ was with His Church.

DR. W. NIESEL (Evangelical Church in Germany) found parts of the report far from clear. He asked for clarification of 'Christ is never without His Church; the Church is never without Christ'; of 'ministry of reconciliation'; and of 'The mystery of His life is the mystery of the Church's life'.

REPORT OF SECOND SECTION ON THE CHURCH

PROFESSOR H. D'ESPINE (Swiss Protestant Church Federation) introduced the report of Section II. He explained that the main subject which the section had studied had been the continuity and the discontinuity of the Church. Much had already been said in previous reports on continuity, so they had dealt with that part of the problem briefly, but had dealt more extensively with the subject of discontinuity in the Church and its causes. They had tried to define more precisely the meaning of the words 'schism', 'apostasy' and 'heresy', and these were the three main topics of the report. Then there was the question of norms—the norms by which Christians could judge—and from that they had turned to the whole subject of Scripture and tradition.

Life in the Church rests upon the operation of the Triune God, but we find a special need to examine the relationship of the Church to Christ. We take as our starting-point the statement of the Commission on the Church:

'Every communion holds that the Church is not a human contrivance, but God's gift for the salvation of the world, that the saving acts of God in Christ brought it into being, that it persists in continuity in history by the presence and power of the Holy Spirit.'

We are agreed that the discussion of the continuity of the Church involves the prior question of the nature of the relationship between Christ and the Church. The continuity of the Church is based upon the fact that Christ is her Head and that therefore there is but one Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, which has received the promise of Christ that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

We are all agreed in understanding the Church as the Body of Christ, not only as a mere metaphor, but as expressing a deep spiritual reality. All agree in finding the presence of Jesus Christ, the crucified and risen Lord, both living in and reigning over His Church. We also acknowledge that the Church is created as the realm of redemption by the sovereign grace of God and is also the sphere of His acts of judgment and reformation. Some would wish to emphasise the solidarity between the Head and the members, others would wish to emphasise the sovereignty of the Head over the members in the Body of Christ. The first view stresses the fulness of Christ as something already received by the Church, though not always consciously apprehended, the other the manifestation of this same fulness at the Second Coming of the Lord in glory.

This difference of emphasis influences our respective opinions upon the nature of continuity. We are all agreed on the continuity assured by the constant action of the risen Lord through the Holy Spirit. We are also all agreed on the value of continuity in history. For all this continuity is assured or guaranteed by certain means under the action of the Holy Spirit. Most would emphasise the continuity of the Christian life, fostered and expressed in the Christian community. Most would also regard the preaching of the Gospel and the ministration of the Sacraments as essential means of continuity. For others, these means of continuity are focused in the historic episcopate in apostolic succession; others possessing and valuing this do not assign to it a dogmatic significance. Some would find the principle of continuity in the historic life of a whole communion to be an organic structure of life and worship, faith and order.

In proceeding to the consideration of the circumstances in which this continuity has been broken, we find that the term 'schism' is not used in the same sense by all members of the section. Some maintain that it can only be used of a breach between church organisations of an identical or closely similar pattern of life, faith and order, whether arising from political, cultural or even personal reasons and leading to administrative or jurisdictional separation, total or partial. In this view the term 'schism' would not be used in cases where matters of heresy were involved. Others, however, are accustomed to use the term in a wider sense to cover the separation of Christian groups on

matters of doctrine (e.g. the Reformation). We would suggest the introduction of another agreed term for such divisions. We cannot find completely satisfactory words, although the terms 'breach' (English), 'rupture' (French), 'Spaltung' (German) were proposed and discussed. In further study of this question, the need is felt to discover words which as far as possible reflect the living nature of the Church.

We notice an increasing reluctance to call each other heretics or schismatics. But the growth of mutual respect and charity and the desire for fuller unity with each other does not exempt us from a serious consideration of the nature of division. We are all agreed that 'tragic' is not too strong a word to express the effect of these divisions. That they sometimes become necessary is a sign of the presence of sin in the world. All would agree that a conflict of 'goods' as well as a choice of evils may be involved in some separations. The Reformation is interpreted by many primarily as an act of obedience to God, while others will find involved in it a sinful breaking of the unity of the Church.

While many Churches would willingly recognise in the origin of their divisions, all would find in their maintenance, a matter in which our guilt is not one-sided but reciprocal. Some divisions arose from vital matters of Christian truth and life, others from impatience on the one side and lack of understanding and vitality on the other—the refusal of a Church to reform itself or to meet new spiritual demands made upon it by its people and its historical situation. Sometimes divisions have occurred by the joint action of ecclesiastical and secular powers, issuing in persecution. There are divisions which do not fall easily into these classifications and which are due in the main to social, cultural or racial tensions. We wish to call attention to the obligation to seek closer organic union which, in our opinion, specially lies upon (a) Churches whose close regional association emphasises their task of bearing a common witness to the non-Christian world; (b) Churches whose historic past lays upon them to a peculiar degree the need for mutual reconciliation; (c) Churches having a close doctrinal or institutional affinity. While, however, we stress the importance of a reunion of Churches of closer spiritual heritage, we do not forget the need for and the possibility of a reunion of wider scope, which may bring together those of very different spiritual heritage. We particularly deplore the tendency to create further divisions in some parts of the world, often for the flimsiest of reasons, which, while we seek a closer unity, threatens to produce an even more disastrous situation.

An important discussion then took place on the concept of our breaches as occurring within rather than from the Church. While

opposition was expressed by those who, for varying reasons, maintain that the *Una Sancta* (the one Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church) cannot be broken, others are prepared to see in this distinction a welcome affirmation of the continued existence of church life on both sides of the breach. It was maintained that each division possesses a *traditio ministrandi* (an ordered pattern of ministry) of the Christian faith, despite elements held in isolation. A protest can easily become a fixed theology. |Such breaches, if always involving loss, do not necessarily mean total shipwreck and it is the duty of all to look forward to a new integration of life and faith and a fulfilment of ministries in future steps towards organic unity. For some people the problem of the divided Church and its reunion is linked to the question of *vestigia ecclesiae* (the characteristics of the Universal Church still existing in the divided Churches). We feel that here is an urgent problem for ecumenical research.

We are led to define apostasy as in essence a denial of the sole Lordship of Christ in profession, attitude or action. Any loyalty, however innocent in itself, when exalted to a point where it conflicts with loyalty to God in Christ, tends towards apostasy. Apostasy is thus a manifestation of satanic power rebelling against God—the sin of Lucifer. It is held that apostasy can take place either in an individual or in a Christian group, but it is not believed that the whole Church could ever fall into apostasy. A special danger lies in the fact that apostasy sometimes clothes itself in a Christian vocabulary and outwardly Christian forms. The final determination and judgment of apostasy belong to God alone and only to the Church as revealed by Him. In our times we find a special urgency in the duty of the Church to reaffirm her sole loyalty to Christ in the face of the insidious advance of secularism, the challenge of state absolutism and the menace of oppression in all its forms (political, economic or even ecclesiastical) in all parts of the world. We prefer, however, to think of apostasy as something against which our denominations as a whole and ourselves as individuals ought to be watchful, rather than to point it out in others.

We now pass to the consideration of heresy, since in the history of the Church heresy and division have often been closely connected. Christian teaching is always integrally related to Christian life, worship and action, just as in New Testament times the *kerygma* (proclamation), *koinonia* (fellowship) and the *diakonia* (Christian service) are not found in separation from each other. Properly speaking, heresy belongs to the first sphere alone and may be defined as an error of doctrine, persistently proclaimed against an established norm of the Church, affecting vital matters of teaching. Since, however, life and

thought, worship and action, are inseparable, it involves a distortion of the spiritual life of the Church and of the organic wholeness of the Christian faith. We are all agreed that there are *necessaria* (necessary articles) in the Christian faith and restrict the word 'heresy' to this sphere, but we are not unanimous about their number and nature. We all recognise the obligation upon the Churches, while seeking to maintain in all its fulness the deposit of faith, to be responsive to the guidance of the Holy Spirit as He fulfils our Lord's promise to lead His Church into all truth and to bear continual witness to Him.

In all these matters judgment should properly belong to the whole visible Church of Christ, but in our divided state this judgment can and must be exercised by individual denominations and even congregations, acting through all their parts or, as others would say, orders. Every effort must be made pastorally and spiritually for the reconciliation of the offender. If, however, sentence must in the last resort be passed upon him, we are united in repudiating any recourse to secular coercion and violence.

We turn next to the norms of the Church. These we found peculiarly difficult to define. Some judge in accordance with the Inner Light and the leadings of the Spirit and are therefore concerned to witness against the use of outward creeds when these are held to be necessary or sufficient. All accepted the Holy Scriptures as either the sole authority for doctrine or the primary and decisive part of those authorities to which they would appeal. Most accept the Ecumenical Creeds as an interpretation of the truth of the Bible or as marking a distinctive stage in the working-out of the orthodox faith. Some assign a special importance to the credal documents of the first four General Councils. Many denominations possess confessional documents in which they express the Christian faith as they read it in the Bible. It would generally be admitted, however, that these last documents would not be regarded as irreformable and they do not in fact occupy the same position in the Rule of Faith of all Churches which possess them.

Different views might be held upon the relation of these norms to Christ Himself, and varying degrees of closeness may be found in their connection with Him. Our differences here appear to be of the same order as our differences upon the relation of Christ and His Church, and many welcome signs of an approximation or even inter-penetration of different traditional ways of thinking can be noted.

Lastly we touch upon the subject of tradition. All Churches represented among us recognise the traditions of their Christian past with gratitude and pride, though some of the younger Churches are keenly aware that as part of this heritage they have inherited divisions for which they are not responsible and controversies which are not their

own. There are, however, among us two distinct emphases upon the relation between Scripture and Tradition. Some would regard Tradition as a living process, whether embodied in written documents or not, continuous with, though not necessarily additional to, the biblical revelation, while others would restrict its character to a clarification and exposition of the content of the biblical Gospel.

DR. F. FISCHER (Evangelical Church in Austria) opened the discussion by speaking on two points: 'the fulness of Christ' and continuity. The Bible had something to say about every situation, and in this case he referred to Colossians 1.24. In the same epistle Paul spoke of the fulness of Christ. This faced us with a paradox. How was the fulness of the Body of Christ expressed? The answer was, not only through continuity but also through suffering. He hoped that the sentence in the report, 'All agree in finding the presence of Jesus Christ . . . both living in and reigning in His Church', would not lead to a false conception of the glory of the Church. Something should be added about the scandal of the Cross, the sufferings of Christ, showing that it was through His suffering that His fulness was revealed. He asked whether there was not an organic development of the fulness of Christ; he thought that as the ecumenical movement continued the suffering would grow. He suggested the insertion in the report of a sentence stating that it was in the Church and the Cross that the fulness of Christ was continued and made visible.

THE REV. K. T. HENDERSON (Church of England in Australia) referred especially to the first lines of the report. He thought that a sentence should be inserted to the effect that they were united as disciples of Jesus of Nazareth and of the teaching that He had given them. He thought the teaching of Jesus Christ in the Beatitudes had prevented Christians from drifting apart altogether and had made them feel sinful when they did so. He hoped that they would be able to affirm their unity as disciples of Jesus of Nazareth and their common acceptance of the teaching that He had given them in the days of His flesh.

PROFESSOR G. FLOROVSKY (Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople) thought the continuity of the Church was insufficiently dealt with in the report. The treatment of apostasy was not strictly related to the main subject, and it was not clear with what schism the report was dealing. The document was interesting as

an introduction to discussion: it was a statement of the confused position in which we find ourselves.

REPORT OF THIRD SECTION ON THE CHURCH

DR. D. HORTON (Congregational Christian Churches, U.S.A.) introduced the report of this section.

I. *The Unity of the Church as indicated in the New Testament*

(a) When we think of the unity of the Church in respect of the term 'People of God' we are all agreed that we must relate it to the other qualifications of the Church in the New Testament, all of which emphasise the Church's unity.

The Church, the newly-constituted 'People of God', called into being by His Word and His Spirit, is a community in which men recognise the Lordship of the one Christ, which lives by His grace, and which is truly prepared for His service. The Church witnesses to Jesus Christ as the Lord of all life, in its worship, in its order, and in its life. Thus by its nature it is destined, confronting mankind with its divine unity, to triumph over the divisions of nations.

This new people of God is described in the New Testament as the Body of Christ. Christ is the Head and He unites all believers in Himself. By the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, sent from the Father by the glorified Son, the redeemed are united into a body, in the world but not of it, as a 'People of God's own possession', who share in common the gifts of the One Spirit. Since the Church is a fellowship in the Holy Spirit it follows that it is a *communio sanctorum*, i.e. a company of the sanctified—forgiven, justified by faith, and born anew in Christ.

(b) (i) In the New Testament the various expressions of faith in Christ are so many interpretations of the God-given revelation in Him.

(ii) While there are indications of diversity in worship in the New Testament, nevertheless the preaching of the Word and the use of the two sacraments of the Gospel were everywhere marks of the Church's unity.

(iii) The evidence of the New Testament about Church Order is variously interpreted among us:

(I) Churches of the Catholic tradition believe that already in the New Testament we find a development from the Apostolic order towards episcopacy, though there were also other ministerial forms subject to Apostolic tradition.

(2) Others hold that development is apparent in the New Testament but that it is not towards episcopacy but towards another order, viz., congregational, presbyteral, etc., and they would claim that this is in accordance with true Catholic tradition.

(3) In the opinion of others, no clear line of development of ecclesiastical order can be discerned in the New Testament. The leadership is designated in different ways but in every case it is subject to the authority of Christ as Lord.

(iv) We all believe that God gives to His Church unity in a rich diversity of works of mercy, moral and social witness, and prophetic insight into human affairs. He united His Church in a love for the brethren and for all mankind which transcends every barrier of race, colour, class and nation.

(v) We would like to stress the fact that in the New Testament the mission of the Church and the unity of the Church are deeply related. Christ called His apostles that they might be one and that He might send them forth to accomplish His mission in the world. He prayed for their unity that the world might believe. It was in obedience to this missionary task, including the willingness to suffer for Christ, that the Church experienced the dynamic power of its unity.

II. *The Unity We have and the Unity We seek*

We affirm again that throughout Christendom there is despite divisions, a unity already given by God in Christ, through whom the powers of the age to come are in our midst. Concerning the fact of this unity and of the participation in it of every Christian communion we have no doubt. The co-operation in the ecumenical movement is one practical proof that this unity is here. We affirm also our faith that the crucified and risen Christ is already working through His Holy Spirit to deliver us from the divisions which obscure this unity, and our sure hope that at His return in glory He will enable the manifestation of this unity to be complete. This very hope lays upon us all the inescapable duty of working and praying for the shortening of the days of our separation, in obedience to Him in whom we affirm ourselves to be one.

We differ, however, in our understanding of the relation of our unity in Christ to the visible Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. We are agreed that there are not two Churches, one visible and the other invisible, but one Church which must find visible expression on earth; but we differ in our belief as to whether certain doctrinal, sacramental and ministerial forms are of the essence of the Church itself.

In consequence we differ in our understanding of the character of the unity of the Church on earth for which we hope (*The Church*, F.O.C. No. 7, pp. 16f.), none of us looks forward to an institution with a rigid uniformity of governmental structure and all of us look forward to a time when all Christians can have unrestricted communion in Sacrament and fellowship with each other.

Yet our differences in the doctrinal and sacramental content of our faith and of our hope do not prevent us from being one in the act of believing and of hoping. For our faith and our hope are in the crucified and risen Jesus Christ, who is already working in us the purpose of His perfect will, and is already gathering up every fragment of obedient endeavour into the consummation of that purpose.

III. *Unity and Diversity*

(a) *Personal Faith in Jesus Christ*

Faith in Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour, the original simple New Testament affirmation, is confessed by all the communions here represented. This common faith allows for certain differences of interpretation and practice.

(b) *Consensus in Doctrine*

There are differences among our Churches as to the measure of doctrinal consensus necessary for unity; nevertheless, we are agreed in our allegiance to the Church's common faith and message as proclaimed in the Holy Scriptures and testified to and safeguarded in the ecumenical creeds. Further, we acknowledge the importance of theological study for intellectual clarification and continuous re-interpretation of the Christian faith in terms of changing life and thought. In listening to one another in ecumenical discussion we move towards a deeper understanding of each other in faith and doctrine.

(c) *Apostolic Order*

All communions possess forms of ministry and order; all, as indicated earlier in this report, find sanctions for these in the New Testament. Differences of interpretation, however, are deeply imbedded in their respective traditions which lead to differences in their views as to what form or forms of church order are needed for the unity of the Church.

Those who represent the Catholic tradition acknowledge only the episcopal church order tracing its origin from apostolic days as wholly meeting the requirements of a unified ministry and of a united Church. Those in this tradition would regard common acceptance of a ministry in this succession as essential for the full unity of the Church, though

there would be disagreements among them as to the kind or the degree of doctrinal interpretation which would be demanded as part of acceptance.

At the opposite extreme we find Churches which, though possessing cherished church orderings, lay no stress upon any particular form of ministerial succession as essential to church order or upon any doctrinal significance thereof.

Between these extremes there are many varieties of church order and of doctrinal interpretations regarding them. The demand, however, by the Lausanne Conference still stands in judgment over us—the demand, namely, for ‘a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church of Christ as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole Body’.

(d) *Forms of Worship and the Sacraments*

The subject of forms of worship and the sacraments is being taken by another section.

(e) *Evangelism*

We all recognise that the Church by its very nature is an evangelising fellowship with an inescapable missionary obligation.

There is, however, among us a serious difference of opinion as to whether a Church has the right to evangelise members of another Christian communion. While some of us deny that such a right exists, others claim that it is an essential part of the commission given to their Church. There are forms of proselytising, however, which are sub-Christian and should, therefore, find no place among the followers of our One Lord. In the United Church this problem would find its solution.

(f) *The Christian Life*

We acknowledge that the Christian experience of God’s redemptive grace finds its expression in Christian life in a variety of ways. We are agreed as to the necessity of witnessing for Christ by word and deed in every human relationship. Service motivated by love is the primary characteristic of the Christian way of living, and life’s true interpretation is to be found in the idea that we are stewards of our Lord. We rejoice in the new emphasis upon the fact that our daily work is a sacred offering to God.

(g) *Cultural Factors*

In regard to the ‘non-theological factors’ we recognise that Christianity makes itself at home in various cultures and takes a colouring

from them. We believe that every nation will bring its tribute to the common treasury of Christian faith and life. Christianity is never to be equated with any culture, however, for it has a Spirit of its own which always transcends social, political, and cultural conditions. The Spirit creates unity, while one of the causes of division lies in the constant peril of absolutising the relative cultural factors. This is exemplified in a tendency of the older Churches to impose their patterns and methods upon the younger Churches.

(h) *Varying Degrees of Recognition*

There is considerable variation in the degree of recognition accorded by one Christian body to another. Within the same confessional family it is customary to regard other regional and national bodies as Christian Churches in the full sense of the word. But full recognition in many instances is not extended outside the same confessional family. For example:

(1) Churches of the Catholic tradition do not usually extend to others outside their tradition the right of participation in their sacramental life.

(2) When a member of one Church in good standing desires to transfer to another communion, some bodies require re-baptism or a new profession of faith.

(3) When a minister desires to transfer from one communion to another, some bodies require re-ordination.

Membership in the World Council of Churches implies a measure of recognition in that the Churches recognise one another as serving one Lord. But differences of faith and order still exist and membership in the Council does not imply that one Church must regard all other members as Churches in the full sense.

A more general form of recognition is extended, on the other hand, by the very fact of joining, in mutual respect, for the study of differences, engaging in co-operative endeavour in Christian action and missions, and occasionally gathering in common worship. In these and other ways Christians recognise one another as belonging to the Body of Christ and pray that they may grow by God's grace into greater unity and more complete mutual recognition.

IV. *Illustrations of United Advance*

We believe that it is God's will that we should be united, and we see in the urgent problems and the desperate needs of the whole modern world new calls and opportunities to hear the unifying Word of God.

In making recommendations that we hope will be effective without raising disagreements of principle, we yet recognise that all our working together is in greater or less measure impeded by the divisions among us created by our disagreements on faith and order. Within the ecumenical movement which has exposed our disagreements, we have none the less become aware of a definite area of unity, and it is being laid upon us by the Holy Spirit and the Word of God to come together increasingly in His service.

We make these recommendations in the conviction that we should do together all that can be done together, and do separately only that which must be done separately. Some of the recommendations that follow are elaborated in the Report of the Second Conference on Faith and Order held in Edinburgh in 1937.

1. We believe that this world can be delivered from its religious disunion and bitter secular feuds only by the initiative and perseverance of personalities capable of challenging their own self-interested groups with the policies of Christian love and by persisting in this course without visible and immediate expectation of success. We affirm that through God's power it is the task of Christian communions to call for and develop such heroism in its members, and to unite those who respond in a fellowship of courage.

2. The separated communions will be helped to come together into the cause of Christian service by realising that the emotional legacy, which hinders their co-operating, is largely the result of what have been called 'the non-theological factors of denominationalism'. These are traditions of a political, national and social character. Awareness of these factors is the first step in ridding ourselves of the divisive feelings that they have aroused. We therefore urge on religious communions wishing to co-operate a special study of these hindrances.

3. We recognise that many of the most pressing and troubling problems of the modern world have arisen subsequent to the forming of our separate traditions of faith and order. They cannot therefore be dealt with adequately from within our traditional divisions. The Churches of to-day have to help each other answer their problems. Individuals equipped with special knowledge and spiritual insight to speak a word from God concerning these problems belong to the whole Church, and such messengers should be given greater opportunities to be heard by all Christian people.

4. We are also bound to pray and work for the restoring of fellowship between those working primarily for the religious, and those working primarily for the material, well-being of their fellow-men.

5. In the terrible division that has split civilisation into 'East' and 'West', we impress on all Christians the need for careful and accurate

statement as to facts, whether in their own sphere of the world or in the other one, and we ask for honest appreciation and just criticism of whatever is good or evil in either way of life as it is being lived. The same spirit should govern words and actions in respect of every division that exists among men, whether between or within nations.

6. We think that we can profit by learning from each other's characteristic habits and methods and cultivating an appreciation of their values, not rejecting what may be profitable because it belongs to another tradition.

7. Realising that the question of intercommunion is being discussed at greater depth elsewhere, we welcome any increase of those occasions in which spiritual intimacy and agreement upon the principles involved makes acceptable and possible the meeting of people of different Christian communions at the Lord's Table.

8. We hope for an increase in the interchange of teachers in theology and the theological intercourse of students in our theological and other colleges; we welcome united courses of study; and we recommend the teaching of the theology and history of the ecumenical movement to theological faculties.

9. In view of the complexity of modern problems for Christian decision, we recommend united study groups for Christians living in the same locality and at work in the same occupational groups. We recommend also the formation and support of local councils of Churches where needed. The ecumenical movement cannot be fully alive unless it is local.

10. We recommend the Churches to make more determined attempts to carry out the proposal made at the Second Conference on Faith and Order at Edinburgh in the following words: 'The Conference (i.e. Edinburgh 1937) urges on all the Churches the desirability of organising and participating in efforts of evangelism in co-operation with Christians of other communions, both as a means of bearing effective witness before the multitudes who are detached from Christianity and as a means of expressing and strengthening that unity in the Gospel which binds together in spiritual fellowship those who own allegiance to different Churches.'

11. We urge church authorities under accepted conditions to open pulpits to ministers of other communions.

12. We commend the principle that older Churches should not unduly impress on younger Churches which have grown out of their missionary efforts, traditions that hinder their forming other Christian ties and impede their freedom of growth within their own societies.

13. We commend the practice of inter-church aid in which Christians, becoming sensitive to the pressing needs of others within the

household of faith, unite to relieve them. And we urge all Christians to unite in the relieving of all kinds of human suffering without questioning the religious profession of the sufferers.

14. We urge that all who speak for Christianity, by either the written or the spoken word, maintain the highest standards of Christian charity, fairness and accuracy.

15. We ask for a greater observance on the part of all Christians of the designated periods of corporate prayer for Christian unity.

We believe that we should thank God for His gift in bringing into existence the World Council of Churches. We must not over-estimate its significance, but still less should we overlook the fact that in it God has given us, for manifesting our fellowship and common responsibility, an instrument which is unique in history.

God has brought us together in years of war and occupation, in prisons and camps, on orphaned fields of mission, and for works of relief and reconstruction. In many quarters we have been brought nearer to each other by a rediscovery of the full message of the Gospel, of the Church, its worship and sacraments, and its service to the world. New forms of Christian community life have sprung up with various denominations. They are the promising signs of the ongoing renewing and uniting work of the Spirit throughout Christ's Church Universal.

In all of these advances the World Council of Churches has acted as a pervasive influence. Through it God, we believe, continues to call us, in the realms of fellowship and united service, to speak the word that is not yet spoken and do the deed that is not yet done.

V. Summary and Prospect

In summary, the nature of the unity towards which we are striving is that of a visible fellowship in which all members, acknowledging Jesus Christ as living Lord and Saviour, shall recognise each other as belonging fully to His Body, to the end that the world may believe.

In His own day Jesus Christ will gather His scattered people to live in eternal union with Him. The joy of that union is already felt in such unitedness as is now ours. With light that pierces the Christian conscience that day of our Lord illuminates the solemn responsibility of every contemporary communion to prepare itself for unity.

Some of us hold that the unity of the Church must be organic as being the unity of the Body of Christ. That Body must be composed of elements belonging to this world of space and time but these elements must be unified as the Body of the Lord by the unifying power of His indwelling Spirit; otherwise it would not be organic. At first sight this conception seems utterly opposed to the notion of a

union of distinct Churches. But a covenant relationship *realised to the full* would bind the Churches together into the organic unity of the Body of Christ, because it would be a relationship *in Christo*, the indwelling *Creator Spiritus* unifying the distinct members.

There are others, however, who hold that to speak of a 'covenant' between denominations of Christians is to use the word 'covenant' in a way which is far removed from the biblical usage and conception. They would emphasise the finality of the 'covenant' once made by God through Christ, and would urge that the task of Christian unity is to make effective our common response to that covenant.

We believe that this is a most fruitful field for further study.

The President opened the meeting for discussion.

DEAN S. J. ENGLAND (Disciples of Christ, U.S.A.) objected to the expression 'Churches of the Catholic tradition'. The purpose of the present conference was to seek ways of uniting the people of God, and this purpose would not be furthered by the use of this expression. Moreover, it was not an accurate one, and was inconsistent with the paragraph in the report of Section I beginning 'We confess our faith in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. . . .' It was also inconsistent with what was said in the report of Section II on the continuity of the Church. He proposed that this expression be studied more carefully.

PASTEUR P. GAGNIER (Reformed Church of France) said that the kind of unity which we are seeking, and which we believe to be part of God's design, was also one of the main topics of Section II. He pointed out two important statements of agreement which were contained in the report of Section III. The first was: 'We are agreed that there are not two Churches, one visible and the other invisible, but one Church which must find visible expression on earth.' He was sure that the views of the Reformers had not been overlooked in this brief statement, but he would like to see another sentence added to express them more explicitly. There was another statement of agreement which we all approve. The unity of the Church will be a symphony of different instruments, provided we all tune ourselves to Christ. This feeling had been strengthened in him by the conference.

DR. J. N. THOMAS (Presbyterian Church in the U.S.) was certain that the influence of social and cultural factors on church unity must be stressed. But Faith and Order paper No. 10,

reflecting the view of the Bossey conference last autumn, emphasised that we should also take account of those factors which unite us, and those which accentuate the need for unity. He therefore suggested adding at some appropriate point in the report the following paragraph:

‘While we recognise that social and cultural factors have operated most significantly to produce divisions among us, we call attention also to the fact that they have sometimes been the cause of overcoming previously existing divisions. The unity found by Christians as the result of persecution is a striking example. Further, we acknowledge and call upon the Church to face certain social and cultural factors which greatly accentuate the need for unity.’

PROFESSOR E. KINDER (Evangelical Church in Germany; Lutheran) drew attention to three points:

(1) The reports of Sections I and II needed co-ordinating: there was some overlapping and some contradiction.

(2) Perhaps the foundation of our unity was expressed too empirically. Our co-operation was indeed a practical proof of unity, but it might give the impression that our unity is deeper than it really is.

(3) The recommendations made in Part IV of the draft were too vague and emotional, and the theological differences ought to be taken more seriously.

DR. D. D. WILLIAMS (Congregational Christian Churches, U.S.A.) urged that a clear statement be added giving the position of those Free Churches which regarded their own form of ministerial succession as valid, while at the same time not insisting that any one form of ministerial succession was essential to the existence of the Church at all times and in all places.

PROFESSOR A. M. RAMSEY (Church of England) made some remarks about the three reports on the Church in general. What, he asked, did they really contribute, and were they really worthy? As the outcome of a few hours' work done by a large group of admirable men, they were remarkable documents. But were they worthy of the antecedent work of the Commission on the Church which had worked under Dr. Newton Flew? They were not. They had not gone much further. It would be a great pity

if members of the Churches read these three reports instead of the report prepared by Dr. Flew's Commission and its accompanying volumes. Members of the Churches should not be diverted from documents of far greater value than these three reports.

From this he drew two morals. At a conference like this we were greatly handicapped if the members had not studied the preliminary documents. On arrival they should be put through an examination on the preparatory material!

But the second moral was this: Might it be that the age of reports produced by the mass procedure of assemblies working in sections is really over?

REPORT OF SECTION IV ON WAYS OF WORSHIP

THE REV. M. WARD (Church of South India) introduced the report, saying:

I ask the indulgence of this conference; I stand in Bishop Lilje's shoes, I cannot take his place.

I think it should be made clear that this report largely shaped itself in the course of our discussions. Again and again the plan to which we worked had to be modified by facts which emerged both in the general and in the group discussions. We were able to reach the agreements, which are recorded in very brief form in the first section, very quickly. The very fact that we state our agreements so briefly is a token of the real understanding established by the whole section.

It was when we came to discuss the disagreements that our form of presentation was constrained by that which emerged in our conversations. We had intended in the first place to set out quite starkly the areas and facts of separation, and then attempt to distinguish therein those which seemed to be essential and those which seemed non-essential. However, the group of our section which first discussed this matter, found that in every case there was such a body of real understanding on the many real disagreements that the expression 'unresolved problems' was given. In each case we have tried to show how, behind the disagreements which stand out, there is real hope of coming together through further conversation and further worship together.

The section on 'non-theological factors' we took very seriously

indeed. In the nature of things we could not do more than present a kind of preface to this new theme of study, but behind this preface lies the conviction of the whole section—a conviction I think shared by the conference as a whole—that many of the causes of our separation which are rooted in this world of time and space and scene must not be allowed any longer. We have offered this preface to be studied in that conviction and in that hope.

In the recommendations there is, I am afraid, one very grave omission. We understood that Section V was dealing with the matter of intercommunion at ecumenical gatherings, and therefore we did not take this up in detail, but I am quite certain that the section does believe that, sooner or later, any insights which are given to us in ecumenical discussion must be embodied in actual patterns of worship. When all is said and done, we learn the meaning of worship, not by talking with one another, or even at one another, in the conference, but by praying together.

PREAMBLE

The decision of the Edinburgh Conference to appoint a Theological Commission on Ways of Worship has proved to be an important step forward in the process of mutual understanding necessary to progress in Christian unity. The work of the Commission has strengthened the conviction that Worship, no less than Faith and Order, is essential to the being of the Church. It has also made it clear that disunity is as manifest in the differing ways of worship as in disagreements concerning doctrines and institutions. Indeed it is at this point that the latter tend to become explicit and the sense of separation is most acute.

Following on the work of the Commission, the Section has attempted to assess the measure of existing agreement and disagreement as to the fact and meaning of Worship; to consider the bearing of this on the Unity of the Church; and to suggest practical measures for the increase of mutual understanding.

AGREEMENTS

- (1) We worship one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, revealed by His mighty acts in history.
- (2) The Triune God is the source and object of our worship.
- (3) God Himself creates the faith by which we respond to Him in worship. Cf. Gal. 2.20. By this we mean that, at the moment of

Christ's encounter with men, they are free to respond; but in the light of this response they understand that they could not have been seeking God had He not already found them, and that the faith by which they responded was itself God's gift to them.

(4) The response claims the whole man. Cf. Matt. 22.37-40. It is made in worship, in witness, and in Christian obedience and service.

(5) The response involves adoration, invocation, confession, supplication, intercession, praise and thanksgiving.

(6) In both Word and Sacrament God draws near to us, speaks to us and offers us His grace. Both are necessary to the fulness of Christian worship.

(7) In the ultimate sense all worship is worship of, and within, the family of God's people, alike in heaven and on earth. Even in private prayer, the Christian is always praying with the Church as a member of the *koinonia*. The worship of the congregation is both the basis of all private prayer and devotion, and a powerful and essential Christian witness to the world.

UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS

The section has attempted here to open the way for further discussion and explanation rather than to make a list of traditional oppositions, which could only frustrate ecumenical progress. The positive character of the statement, however, does not involve an unreal harmonisation of differences which are firmly and sincerely held. The proposals for furthering useful and honest discussion are offered on the basis of the actual views held by the Churches represented in the section. Conversation on the various differences in the doctrine and practice of worship has strengthened the conviction that we ought not, as Christians, to admit that any subject is intractable or that any obstacle is insuperable. Of this hope, the meetings of the section have given increasing evidence.

(1) Differences of opinion as to the relation of Word and Sacrament have led to varying stresses upon the importance of preaching and the Sacraments. This should never be more than a matter of emphasis. God's redeeming activity takes place in the worship which He has established in His Church. The unity of worship ought to be stressed if we are to have it in its fulness.

(2) Although we all agree that worship is a spiritual act we give different emphases to the place of material things in worship. For some, many earthly elements when blessed may have a quasi-sacramental use; for others, only the elements of water, bread, and wine,¹ which the Lord has appointed, ought to play a distinctive rôle in

¹ The case of oil raises peculiar problems.

worship. Therefore the use of material things must be carefully studied in the light of our agreement that Christian worship takes place as the Triune God makes Himself known to His people in Word and Sacrament. Through the Holy Spirit God comes to His people redeeming not only them, but also in some sense, the whole creation.

In all our discussions attention should be given to the urgent problem of the prayer life of those, for instance mothers of families, who find it difficult to attend church regularly and to use the appointed means of grace.

(3) Worship is always the worship of the whole people of God, the whole Church. The leadership of this worship can on some occasions be entrusted to any member. Yet, most of our Churches believe that our Lord has called forth in His Church a stated ministry. To this ministry alone the leadership of certain acts of worship is restricted. This raises for us the question of the basis of this restriction. For some of us this restriction rests upon the belief that the Church by the guidance of the Holy Spirit calls some of its members to this or that function. For others this restriction is based upon the belief that the Holy Spirit gives to some members of the Church the appropriate grace of holy order.

Unfortunately the definition of a valid ministry still remains a grave obstacle to unity. The doctrine of the Apostolic succession in particular needs to be faced fully and frankly.

(4) It cannot be denied that there is tension between the Churches as to the use of liturgical or non-liturgical forms of worship. Nevertheless our conversations have revealed that there is a place and value for both. There are those among us, using liturgical forms, who yet feel that there are times when much greater freedom is both desired and desirable. It is the task of the Church to use liturgical prayer as a means of disciplining and enlarging the private prayer of the individual; while the private prayer of the individual, in its turn, quickens the liturgical life and purges it from the taint of formalism. In both, of course, it is all, in the end, the work of the Holy Spirit.

(5) We record in thankfulness that we have reached a measure of agreement which none of us could have anticipated, on the problem of the sacrificial element in Holy Communion.

Our Lord Jesus Christ in all His life on earth and chiefly in His one perfect and sufficient sacrifice on Calvary offered perfect obedience to the Father for the sin of the whole world. So in His risen and ascended life He ever makes the same intercession for us. We unite, therefore, in affirming this sacrificial background to all true worship. There is, moreover, we all agree, an element of mystery in Christian worship which can be known only in faith.

Our response in worship is then the praise, prayer, thanksgiving, and offering of ourselves in faith and obedience, made to the Father in the name of Jesus Christ. Some of us, however, believe that it is in the Holy Eucharist that our Lord as our great High Priest unites the oblation of His Body the Church with His own perfect sacrifice, and so takes up her adoration into the Sanctus of the company of heaven.

(6) We are agreed in believing in the Communion of Saints as the fellowship of the whole company of believers on earth as in heaven. In its worship, the Church Militant is united with the Church Triumphant, joining in prayer and praise with angels and archangels and all the company of heaven. Of this we are made especially aware at the Lord's Table, where, through union with Christ crucified, risen, and ascended, we enter more closely into communion with the company of heaven.

On the other hand, we have to record certain clear divergences of belief.

Some believe that we are justified in venerating and praising the saints in glory, and especially the Blessed Virgin Mary, and seeking their intercession on our behalf, and that in this way they can help us who are still engaged in the earthly spiritual warfare.

Others believe that all this has no justification in Holy Scripture; Jesus Christ Himself being the sole and sufficient Mediator and Advocate.

Another divergence of view emerges in connection with the practice of prayers for the departed. Some hold that those of the departed who did not fully repent on earth require the help of our prayers, and that we therefore have a duty to intercede for them. Others hold that death being the decisive moment, at which the destiny of the soul is finally determined, it is only possible to commit the departed into God's hands, knowing that He, the Judge of all the earth, will do right, and that we can utterly trust in His infinite mercy.

NON-THEOLOGICAL FACTORS

Thus far the Report has been concerned largely with the theology which underlies the agreements and disagreements in ways of worship. In considering our differences, however, we have been constrained to ask whether they spring, wholly or in part, from social, cultural and other factors. In what follows we offer suggestions towards a new line of approach which may help the Churches to see that many of the differences in ways of worship are not bound up, as has been thought, with irreconcilable dogmatic differences, but may co-exist in one Church.

The Churches on earth are *in via*, and therefore involved at every

level in the tensions and conflicts of history. This involvement shows itself in their traditions of worship. Even the most cursory survey of these 'ways of worship' reveals the large part played by many sorts of non-theological factors.

In the statement we intend to concentrate on two of these, the social and psychological. At certain very important points these overlap as cause-factors making for the estrangement of Christian bodies. For instance, there is the crucial factor of language which operates both psychologically and socially. Round the expressions in a language there tends to gather a whole fabric of associations which are lost in translation, but which colour the use of the expressions in prayer and worship. Moreover, habits of worship differ from country to country. We have all heard of worshippers who complain that they cannot abide the 'foreign ways' of the people of such and such a land at prayer. The style of behaviour seems to get in the way of the stranger's devotion. Here too we have an overlap of psychological and social factors.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that such intimacy of relation between faith and cultural tradition is a bad thing. On the contrary it often makes for health and vivacity of spiritual tradition. But because human beings are sinners, we have to reckon with the possibility of profound corruption here. A particular Church may unconsciously, in liturgical forms, take for granted social and political institutions which have received drastic criticism at once in theory and practice. For instance the prayer for the Church Militant in the 1662 Anglican Liturgy and certain clauses of the Anglican Litany belong to a quite different ordering of society than that of Great Britain to-day. A stranger must be puzzled, even antagonised by such archaism. In a divided Christendom such phenomena can easily create the impression that reconciliation between Churches involves the acceptance of what belongs to the accidents of their worldly history rather than to the vital substance of their faith. This is particularly serious when members of Christian Churches 'have done one another wrong' in conflicts which were social and political as well as religious in origin. What is needed here is a certain theological ruthlessness, combined with the realisation that, in the providence of God, what now seems to divide at this level can be so transformed as to enrich the experience of the whole people of God. For it is in His will that His Church has been placed in the world and in the midst of secular history. 'I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world: but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil one.'

It must be emphasised, however, that these political and social factors operate not merely to postpone re-union, but frequently

contribute to hinder evangelism and to damage the internal life of individual Churches. Thus within the same Church there are often great differences of idiom between congregations recruited from different social classes. While there are perhaps signs of improvement discernible, one cannot neglect the many unhappy examples within Churches of discrimination practised on grounds of class, economic level, politics and race. When these are continued to this present or actually introduced *de novo*, existing divisions are not only hardened, but Churches are split on occasion into additional fragments.

Archaism of devotional habit also prevents the development of the sort of liturgical forms suitable to the age in which we live. For instance, we do well to question what the view of nature implicit in the canticle *Benedicite* conveys to men equipped with skill to effect the colossal transformations of natural forces which are a commonplace of our day. It is not only the cause of Christian unity that compels us to rigorous and painful self-scrutiny at these points: it is the cause of evangelism itself that demands we sit in judgment on our forms of worship. Christian worship must indeed not be subordinated to the fluctuating requirements of human nature; it has its background in God's initiative and His revelation. But its gracious content must be presented in a manner congruent with the realities of our common life.

The study of social factors in their impact on our ways of worship is in its infancy. Its prosecution is the commanding duty of the ecumenical movement. When we pass to the psychological side of our statement we come to a field in which we are at present perhaps even more amateurs. At least however we must note the importance as a force of division of the attraction felt by some and the repulsion felt by others, when an elaborate ritual is used which seems designed to evoke a sense of mystery. There are many both learned and simple who find their imaginations stimulated by such symbolism; others mistrust what seems to them to savour of trickery and an assault on our emotions. Here puritan and man of science are at one in their reactions; both show a single-minded repudiation of what seems to them obscure, unreal and artificial. Their challenge is an important one and it cannot be dismissed as simply philistine. There is need for a thorough exploration of the concept of mystery in its bearing on worship, an exploration at once theological, metaphysical and psychological. This exploration would, of course, have to consider not only the way in which craving for mystery is met in elaborate liturgical worship, but also the way in which it is met in the charismatic forms characteristic of Pentecostals and others, whose life can easily be ignored by the theologically sophisticated. It remains sadly true that among Christians the willingness to submit their devotional preferences to any kind of psychological

scrutiny is rare; until it is more common, we are not perhaps likely to advance far in liberating ourselves from the dominion of what can be merely a matter of personal choice or chance inheritance. Until we have attempted this, it is open to question how far we stand under the sovereignty of faith and are ready to meet the demands made upon us in this age.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) Recognising that Worship belongs to the same context as Faith and Order, we believe that its significance should be marked by the inclusion of the word in the title and scope of the Theological Commission of the World Council of Churches.

(2) The Churches may be asked to follow up the work of the Commission on Ways of Worship on the following lines:

(a) The cultivation of a sympathetic and reverent attitude by all Christian people towards all forms of worship, both liturgical and non-liturgical, in which God confronts man.

(b) Detailed scrutiny of the grounds upon which the worship of each communion is based, and in this light the re-examination of its attitude to that of others.

(c) Reflection on the question: How far does the fact that there are varieties in forms of worship within the same communions make it possible to conceive of a similar rich diversity within a united Church?

(d) Study of the liturgical movements going on in various parts of the world.

(e) Thorough examination of the relationship between the unique sacrifice of Jesus Christ and man's response in worship and life.

(f) The promotion of an analysis, psychological, historical, and theological, of the conditions and circumstances, both of origin and development, of particular traditions of Christian faith and worship.

(g) A more detailed exploration, theological, metaphysical and psychological, of *mystery* in relation to worship. If this enterprise recommends itself we urge a proper co-operation with those expert in the psychological material relevant to our purpose.

N.B.—We stress the need to enlist the interest not only of liturgical experts, and of those responsible for the conduct of worship, but especially of members of the worshipping congregations.

(3) In the realm of immediate practical steps towards this end, we suggest:

(a) The holding of inter-confessional retreats, conferences, etc., for the study of the meaning of ways of worship, and of the spiritual life.

(b) The widest possible observance of the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity.

(c) The study by the theological commissions of the member Churches of the material prepared for and at the Lund Conference.

(d) The inclusion in the curricula of theological colleges of courses on worship in an ecumenical setting.

(e) The encouragement of members of the member Churches to take advantage of what is offered by the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, the Student Christian Movement, etc., in this context.

(f) The request to those and similar organisations to give the fullest attention to the subject of worship in planning their work.

(g) The interchange of theological students and teachers.

(h) Joint discussions at all levels in the Churches on the meaning of Baptism.

(i) The inclusion in the teaching of worship within each communion of opportunities to attend the worship of other traditions.

N.B.—Some members of the section desire that it should be made clear that the acceptance of these suggestions, especially the latter points, must be subject to the provisions of church discipline and of pastoral wisdom.

The President opened the meeting for discussion.

FATHER H. E. SYMONDS, C.R. (Church of the Province of S. Africa (Anglican)) commented on the reference to the sacrificial element in the Holy Communion under No. 5 of 'Unresolved Problems', speaking from the point of view of what is generally called the Catholic tradition. He suggested the addition of the words:

As our Lord offers His eternal sacrifice for ever and ever, so in the Eucharist He does the same through His priestly Body the Church, and the priest of the Church as His earthly instrument and the representative of the Church.

He added that they obviously repudiated any suggestion of a repetition of the sacrifice of Calvary, still more (to use a dreadful phrase) any 'reslaying of Christ', as was perhaps held at the time of the Reformation; but they did claim, in accordance with the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that we take our part in the eternal offering of the sacrifice of Christ which our Lord makes at the Heavenly Altar.

MR. E. HAYMAN (Church of England; Consultant). After a fairly long experience in ecumenical work I am now convinced that the liturgical approach is essential to ecumenical progress. We seem to have reached a stalemate, for the time being, in purely dogmatic work. It is obvious that far more needs to be done in that field, but the line of advance will remain obscure until there is a better understanding of the worship of the Church. Liturgy is the focal point round which ecumenical work must now move, because it is alive, and because it is totally dependent on God. The dogmatic work of Faith and Order had already reached a mature stage before the liturgical work began. This was right and necessary. Edinburgh 1937 reached a peak in the ecumenical ascent; we are now in some danger of finding a depressing trough in dogmatics. On the firm basis of a new liturgical study the dogmatic work will, I believe, be released into new and even greater possibilities.

The Theological Commission on Ways of Worship brought evidence to this conference which, even in its admittedly incomplete presentation, discloses clear and objective facts. It is based on the beginnings of liturgical renewal in Holland, Germany, France and Switzerland. These renewals, spontaneous and largely unconnected, are clear evidence of the Holy Spirit's moving over the chaos of post-war Europe. They have disclosed common treasure long buried, and are bringing new life and hope in a situation that was near to despair. Europe is part of an ancient order; it cannot be nourished for ever on shapeless and disordered patterns of worship. Our evidence shows that the simple and still largely unknown resurgence of liturgical practice is being used of God to bring order out of chaos. This is not an order imposed by *Diktat*; it is a foretaste of that tranquillity of order wherein is the peace of God. The liturgical return is bringing back to the Church in Europe the forgotten joys of free obedience and of a true society, for liturgy is supremely the creative factor in social life. At the close of the Commission's first liturgical retreat in April 1951, a German Lutheran theologian said to us: 'The Church's renewal will come from the altar, not from the university'.

I would therefore ask the conference to lay upon its new Faith and Order Commission the task of making full and continuing provision for the informed study of liturgical and ascetic theology

in its bearing upon the ecumenical situation. It is my conviction that none of our tasks is more urgent.

PROFESSOR T. F. TORRANCE (Church of Scotland; Consultant). It is time someone expressed appreciation of the report, and I wish to say that I feel that this report has made decided progress. In particular, the penetrating account of the non-theological factors in worship is certainly one of the best contributions so far before us. I wish to draw attention to one point only.

Had the earlier part of this report penetrated as deeply into the real issue as the second part, it would have dealt more decisively with the word 'unity'. How does Christ unite our offering with Him? I think we are agreed that we cannot think of our earthly liturgy except in intimate relationship with, and in some kind of participation in, the heavenly liturgy. The real problem that divides us is this: How exactly are we to see that relationship? Is it to be an eschatological relationship, or is the relationship to be conceived platonically?

It seems to me that modern biblical scholarship has revealed something fundamental. If we take the last book of the Bible, which is the most liturgical and the most eschatological, we see something like this. St. John on Sunday morning is thinking of the eucharistic liturgy, and perhaps going over it in his mind, because clearly snatches of it broke through his mind and his vision. But he is in the Spirit and he only hears the heavenly liturgy, the new song of the redeemed, which cannot be transcribed into the language of earth. The earthly liturgy is in his mind, but when the heavenly liturgy echoes through it it is clear that the earthly liturgy is fragmentary in form.

We must pursue this thought and cut out the really damaging thing, the importation of Pelagianism into the relationship of the earthly liturgy and the heavenly liturgy. It is at this point that the real problem of intercommunion goes down into the depths.

DR. H. OBENDIEK (Evangelical Church in Germany) asked why 'the Word' had not been included in point (3) of 'Agreements', and whether it had been omitted unintentionally. The relationship of the Church's mission and the preaching of the Word seemed to indicate that one of the means of grace is the sermon, and that should be included and discussed at that point.

FATHER A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M. (Church of England; Consultant) was disappointed that the report did not appear to have

made more use of what seemed to him the most important thing in the preparatory volumes, namely the essay at the end of the Ways of Worship volume, 'An Approach to the Work of Reunion through common devotional Understanding'. When we worshipped together with other people and heard them pray, we discovered that we thought and acted differently, and he believed that these differences were much more fundamental than our dogmatic differences.

PREBENDARY A. J. MACDONALD (Church of England; Consultant) referred to the phrase 'archaism of devotional habit'. He thought there might be something to be said for this statement but not very much. It must not be forgotten that the *Una Sancta* not only exists to-day but should unite us with the Church of the past—the immediate past, the Reformation past, the medieval past, the Early Church past. Therefore a refusal to express liturgical forms in language which must to some extent be archaic meant cutting the tradition, and breaking the connection with the past which was so valuable.

PROFESSOR G. FLOROVSKY (Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople) asked whether *priesthood* did not play a permanent role in the majority of the Churches. It was not enough, in point (3) of 'Unresolved Problems', to mention the ministry; the real point was not validity of orders, but the existence of the basic priesthood of the Church, and some attention should be given to this central problem.

DR. P. S. MINEAR (Congregational Christian Churches, U.S.A.) thought that in the New Testament no line was drawn between public forms of regular worship and the whole life of the Christian in the world. The man's worship was his whole life, and the test of worship was perfect obedience.

REV. D. B. KNOX (Church of England in Australia) drew attention to the fact that the objection to prayers for the dead is chiefly that they are not scriptural in the view of those who do not use them, and that worship, in the view of such people, should always be scriptural if it is to be offered in faith. It might also be pointed out that those who hold that view believe that prayers for the dead are contrary to the doctrine of justification by faith alone.

PROFESSOR D. M. MACKINNON (Episcopal Church in Scotland). Both Mr. Hayman and Professor Florovsky alike called attention

to the great importance of the problem of the priesthood. Both alike gave an affirmative answer to the question: is the Christian minister a priest? Now that is very important indeed, and I would like to suggest to you that it raises not simply issues of theology but issues belonging to that section of our deliberations which deals with 'non-theological factors'. For there is no doubt that the 'vicar' or 'priest' has contributed not simply to the separation of Christians one from another, but also to the separation of the Christian Church from the world. The issue of priesthood raises questions touching not simply theology but the total relationship of the Church to the world. We are heirs of the Enlightenment as well as of the Reformation and all that preceded it. We must discuss more thoroughly than we have done this question of priesthood, but let us in doing so treat it as a part of the continuous argument between the Church and the world.

REPORT OF SECTION V ON INTERCOMMUNION

DR. E. A. PAYNE, introducing the report, said that the crux of it lay in Parts III and IV, 'The Ordering of the Lord's Table' and 'The Way Forward.' In Part III an attempt had been made to sum up some of the agreements and disagreements with regard to the Lord's Table and the Holy Communion. In Part IV the section had put forward certain statements of belief with which they had been impressed. It must be made quite clear what measure of support there had been within the section for the different statements made. In Part IV, to the three statements under A, every one would give adherence, where those of different traditions were invited to give attention to certain points which might lead to some alterations in practice. Under B, two further statements were made which had considerable weight of agreement behind them but to which strong objection was taken by some other members of the section. The reasons for their objections were quite obvious to any who read through Part III, for there the divergences were set out. But the representatives of the Lutheran Church in the section did not feel that the objections had been sufficiently clearly stated, so that a footnote had been added in their name. Yet it should be understood that it was not only Lutherans from whom objections had come. The Orthodox members and many of the Anglicans would not be

happy with the statement either. It might be possible, when the draft returned to the section on the following day, to get such agreement over the clear statement of differences that no footnote would be needed. They would also give closer scrutiny to the wording of Part V, on Holy Communion at ecumenical gatherings, because in its present wording it had been somewhat hurriedly adopted.

He then presented for discussion the Report of which the text was as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

A

In the Report of the Second World Conference on Faith and Order at Edinburgh in 1937, the statement is made: 'We regard sacramental intercommunion as a necessary part of any satisfactory church unity.' The Continuation Committee felt the need of at once setting up a Commission to study the problems involved in the achievement of intercommunion, and made this one of the main subjects for consideration at the Lund Conference. During the past fifteen years, the Churches have drawn closer together in worship, thought, and service. As a consequence, the necessity of making progress towards closer fellowship at the Lord's Table has grown in urgency.

(1) By joining together in the World Council of Churches we have taken a decisive step in affirming our will to stay together and to bear one another's burdens. This new commitment raises ever more sharply the question of what justification remains for our continuing in division at the Lord's Table.

We desire no move toward intercommunion which would be achieved through treating our differences superficially or which would use intercommunion as a means of by-passing difficulties. But we are painfully conscious that as long as we remain divided at the Lord's Table, we cannot fully enjoy and express the unity which has been given us in Christ.

(2) New factors in our historical situation demand that any barriers to fellowship in communion which are not based on fundamental divergencies of faith or order should be removed as speedily as possible. We need only refer here to the new missionary opportunities in Asia and Africa, the tragic stress of persecution and war conditions, the new inter-church agreements and unions in both East and West, and the increasing demand of Christian youth to be set free from barriers to unity in fellowship and action.

(3) The ultimate urgency comes from our Lord's present call to us.

We believe that He calls His Church to-day to lay open all its life to His transforming power. In our earthly pilgrimage we are always under His judgment, and in the midst of our divisions live always toward the day of His final sifting of those who in faith have truly served Him and those who have not. We stand under the imperative of Christ's prayer that we all may be one. We must work and pray to overcome whatever separates us from one another in the sacrament of Holy Communion.

B

During the years since the Edinburgh Conference we have become increasingly conscious of the depth and difficulty of the issues of faith and order which must be faced. It is not a question merely of human pride and stubbornness, much as we confess that these are operative in all of us. The difficulties arise out of profoundly held differences of conviction about the nature of the Church and of the sacraments. These cause grief and perplexity to us all.

For many of us the Open Services of Holy Communion held at Tambaram, Amsterdam and Lund have been encouraging events of ecumenical fellowship in the central act of the Church's worship. The fact that others could not conscientiously participate in these services has demonstrated to all of us the difficulty of our problem. But the prayerful self-searching in love which all of us have been forced to make on such occasions is an earnest of the Lord's continual presence and of His ultimate purpose to make us one in Him.

We acknowledge the complexity of the task which still lies before us, but are encouraged since we believe we see more clearly what still needs to be done.

II. TERMINOLOGY

In the Edinburgh Report, the conviction was expressed that, when the term 'intercommunion' is used in discussions of church unity, 'its meaning should be clearly defined'. The developments of recent years have made this essential, but the relationships which exist between Churches are so varied that it is extremely difficult to find a terminology that is generally acceptable and can be easily understood by different traditions and in different languages.

The word 'communion', or *koinonia*, denotes unity of fellowship in the whole life of the Church. The word 'communion' has also come to be applied in a special sense by many Christians to the Lord's Supper.

For purposes of ecumenical discussion, and with respect to the relations between separated Churches, the following usages and definitions

seem advisable. It is important to remember, however, that none of the relationships described below can be regarded as the fulfilment of that complete unity which we believe to be God's will for His Church. It should also be noted that the following categories are not all mutually exclusive.

(1) *Full Communion* (though the adjective need rarely be used): where Churches in doctrinal agreement, or of the same confessional family, allow communicant members freely to communicate at the altars of each, and where there is freedom of ministers to officiate sacramentally in either Church (i.e. *Intercelebration*) e.g. the Orthodox, Anglican, Lutheran, and Reformed (Presbyterian) 'families' of Churches, respectively.

(2) *Intercommunion and Intercelebration*: where two Churches not of the same confessional family, by agreement allow communicant members freely to communicate at the altars of each, and where there is freedom of ministers to officiate sacramentally in either Church, e.g. Lutheran and Reformed Churches in France.

N.B.—The relations at present existing between the Church of South India and the Church of England are a special case of this kind, involving certain specific limitations.

(3) *Intercommunion*: where two Churches, not of the same confessional family, by agreement allow communicant members freely to communicate at the altars of each, e.g. Church of England and Old Catholics, Protestant Episcopal Church and Polish National Catholic Church in U.S.A.

(4) *Open Communion*: where a Church on principle invites members of other Churches to receive communion when they are present at its communion services, e.g. the Methodist, Congregationalist, and most of the Reformed Churches.

(5) *Mutual Open Communion*: where two or more Churches on principle invite each other's members and the members are free to accept the invitation. This does not necessarily involve intercelebration.

(6) *Limited Open Communion* (Communion by Economy or Dispensation): the admission of members of other Churches not in full communion or intercommunion to the sacrament in cases of emergency or in other special circumstances.

(7) *Closed Communion*: where a Church limits participation in the Lord's Supper to its own members.

III. THE ORDERING OF THE LORD'S TABLE

A

(1) We are agreed in affirming that the Table is the Lord's and that He gives Himself to us in the sacrament of Holy Communion. When we are unable to share together in the Lord's Supper the pain of our divisions is most severely felt, because we seek the one Lord, and know that we should be able to partake as brethren in the family of God at one Table.

(2) We further agree that the responsibility for the due ordering of the Table in the name of Christ has been committed to the Church. She has to warn her members that if they 'eat and drink unworthily, not discerning the Lord's Body' they bring themselves under judgment. Because of our divisions the exercise of this responsibility, in the formulation of regulations for admission to the Table, is carried out by the several Churches. In this administration each has a grave responsibility before God, particularly if it withholds the sacrament from any of God's people. Baptism, instruction, profession of faith, and some standard of Christian conduct are generally required.² Thus the requirement of episcopal Confirmation on the part of some Churches is only one form in which the Church's responsibility is discharged. Those Churches which practise Open Communion have their own requirements for participation; the invitation extended is not to be interpreted as applying to the unbelieving or the unprepared.

B

We differ as to the right or responsibility of a Church to refuse admission to the Lord's Table to members of other Churches, or to restrain its own members from participating in the sacraments of another Church, on the grounds of divergence in faith or order. Many, without for a moment losing sight of the ultimate goal of full unity, believe that there already exists among the members of the World Council of Churches such a fundamental unity as to justify, or indeed require, joint participation at the Lord's Table. Others, without questioning the reality of our present unity, believe that fellowship in the sacrament rightly exists only where there is fuller agreement in doctrine, a mutually acceptable ministry, or organic unity of church life.

C

The character and extent of our differences in faith and order have already been examined in earlier sections of this Report and the

² In the case of the Orthodox Church infants receive the sacrament of Holy Communion upon the ground of their sponsors' faith.

achievement of full sacramental fellowship depends, in part at least, upon agreement in these matters. Although we cannot therefore envisage any immediate solution to the problems involved in intercommunion, there are encouragements to record:

(1) We are agreed in recognising the administration of the Lord's Supper in the divided Churches, when controlled by the words of institution, as real means of grace through which Christ gives Himself to those who in faith receive the appointed elements of bread and wine.

(2) The Churches have progressed towards unity in their understanding of the theological interpretation of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and we believe that agreement in this field is in fact greater than commonly appears. We have studied with satisfaction the statement of doctrine contained in the Report of the preparatory Commission on Intercommunion (pp. 29-30), and believe that the great majority of our Churches are able to accept it in this slightly amended form: This dominical sacrament, controlled by the words of institution, is (a) a memorial of Christ's incarnation and earthly ministry, of His death, and resurrection; (b) a sacrament of His Body and Blood in which He is truly present to give Himself to us, uniting us to Himself, to His eternal Sacrifice, and to one another, through the use of His appointed elements of bread and wine; and (c) eschatologically, an anticipation of our fellowship with Christ in His eternal kingdom.

(3) No one of the member Churches of the World Council so strictly interprets its responsibility for the ordering of the Lord's Table as to deny the sacrament to members of other Churches in cases of urgent need.

(4) All our Churches are profoundly concerned about the problems connected with intercommunion, and the fact that differences in practice and theology do not here correspond exactly to denominational or confessional boundaries opens up prospects of further understanding.

IV. THE WAY FORWARD?

In spite of the differences and unresolved tensions that exist among us, we have all been impressed by certain statements and pleas made to us from many different parts of the world, and believe that they should receive most careful consideration by our Churches.

A

(1) Churches which require full doctrinal agreement prior to communion fellowship and Churches which require episcopal ordination as the test of a valid sacrament should carefully re-examine their practice in the light of exceptions which are already customary by way of

Limited Open Communion, or Communion by Economy or Dispensation.

(2) Churches which practise Mutual Open Communion should seriously examine the objections to the practice urged on grounds both of doctrine and order. They should also ask themselves whether they could not and should not move on towards a closer relationship of visible unity, in view of the relationship of the sacrament to the wholeness of the Church.

(3) All Churches should re-examine their ways of ordering and administering the Lord's Supper with a view to discovering whether there is or can be agreement with regard to the basic requirements from communicants. Greater thought and care on this matter by all Churches might well pave the way for closer agreement and help towards relationships of intercommunion where these do not at present exist.

B

The following statements command a very considerable weight of agreement among us, but are strongly objected to by certain of our number:³

(1) The best preparation for the fuller unity to which we look forward would be the extension of the practice of intercommunion between different Churches. This is borne out by the experience of the Churches in South India in the years leading up to the union of 1947. Intercommunion is not a substitute for reunion. It is not an end in itself. It does not imply that all differences are resolved or have lost their significance. While intercommunion is, in many ways, illogical and anomalous, we ought to realise that the situation in which we all stand and with which we have to deal is itself highly anomalous. By membership together in the World Council of Churches we all recognise in each other's Churches 'elements of the true Church' (*The Church, the Churches and the World Council of Churches*, IV, 5) and yet we are separated from each other. There will be no perfect solution of

³ Among these the representatives in this section of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany wish to state that their objections are based upon the following grounds: 'The plea to approach church unity by establishing intercommunion is based upon a definite conception of the Lord's Supper. If we agreed to this plea we should have to acknowledge that our own conception of the Lord's Supper is the same as, or only insignificantly different from, this underlying conception. We cannot admit that. In our opinion the whole question is not concerned with slightly diverse theological opinions or a certain mode of ordering the Lord's Table, but with the particular gift of the Lord's Supper as we understand it, i.e. the real presence of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ in the elements of bread and wine.'

our problem until full visible unity. In the meantime, the extension of the practice of intercommunion, with all its difficulties, appears to be the best way forward.

(2) Where there still cannot be any formal relationship of intercommunion, there should be an extension of the practice of open Communion services on special occasions and in special circumstances. This matter is discussed by a number of essayists in Part III of the volume *Intercommunion*. This volume deserves the most careful attention and should receive earnest and sympathetic study by all our church authorities.

V. COMMUNION SERVICES AT ECUMENICAL GATHERINGS

The growth of the ecumenical movement has greatly sharpened in recent years the problem of Communion services being held in the setting of conferences where Christians from a variety of Churches are gathered together for some days or weeks. Their life and worship together are not complete unless they can have the fellowship of the Lord's Table. In cases where all the Churches represented are in Full Communion or Intercommunion with each other (or are even prepared to sanction an Open Communion on such occasions), there need be no difficulty; a single Communion service can be arranged, at which a minister will celebrate according to the order of his own Church, and all can partake. But where these conditions do not exist there is a real problem, which has been felt acutely by many in recent years.

It is to the Church of Christ, and not to any committee or conference as such, that the sacrament of Holy Communion is entrusted, and wherever a minister celebrates, his action involves the implicit claim that he does so as a minister of the Church Universal. Even though a body of persons gathered together in the name of Christ is regarded as a temporary and local expression of the Church, this must not be held to mean that a conference as such can celebrate the sacrament, and this becomes especially obvious when the various Churches represented are not in full communion with each other, and their members cannot all meet at the Lord's Table. In these circumstances no Communion service which is held can be regarded as *the* Communion service of the conference. Yet there must be opportunity for Holy Communion. For such difficult situations we wish to make the following recommendations:

(1) There should always be a united service of preparation for Holy Communion, with special emphasis on the note of penitence for our separation from each other.

(2) Provision should be made for the needs of all members of a conference in the matter of Holy Communion. It is desirable that there should be an Open Communion service for those members of the gathering who are prepared to accept such an open invitation, the celebrant being a minister of a Church which sanctions such services, by invitation of the local church or otherwise. (Usually a very large proportion of the members of a Conference will partake. Notable examples of this were the Communion services held in the Nieuwe Kerk of Amsterdam in 1948 and in Lund Cathedral in 1952, and we regard such memorable occasions as of quite historic importance. At the I.M.C. Conference at Tambaram in 1938, two Open Communion services were held, one of which was Anglican.) There should also always be provision for such other Communion services at different times as will make it possible for every member of the Conference to receive Communion somewhere without violation of his own conscience.

(3) It is important that those who cannot partake at a particular Communion service should be invited to attend the service as worshippers, though they cannot receive Communion.⁴ This has been found by many to be a real means of grace, and of deeper understanding and fellowship.

As regards Communion services in ecumenical institutions (in distinction from temporary gatherings), these should be governed by similar principles. In every case a celebration will be by a minister who, as a minister of the Church Universal, will celebrate according to the order of his own Church, and issue such an invitation as he is authorised to give.

In making these recommendations we realise that they do not by any means remove the pain and scandal of the situation, and we are agreed that this particular aspect of the problem of intercommunion should be very strongly driven home upon the conscience of the Churches and the leaders of the ecumenical movement.

After the President had opened the meeting for discussion, DR. J. H. BODENSIECK (American Lutheran Church) stated that, as a representative of the American Lutheran Church, he would, had he been a member of Section V, have joined with those who put in the footnote. But these were matters in which majority and minority votes were ineffective, though he must express his conviction that Intercommunion was not a way to

⁴ Many would understand their worship on such occasions as an opportunity for concelebration and spiritual communion.

achieve union but a consummation of union when it has been achieved.

DR. E. R. FAIRWEATHER (Church of England in Canada) wished to speak on the same section of the report (IV, B). He felt that it was unfair to accompany that statement in paragraph IV, B, with only one footnote, since the paragraph might be construed as the exhortation of a pressure group within the Conference, and it was not only Lutherans who felt the uneasiness expressed in the footnote. He recommended either an omission of the recommendation in B or a fuller statement of the variety of scruples regarding it.

DR. H. J. A. MEYER (Evangelical Church in Germany) said that in his opinion the paragraph (1) under Introduction I, A, 'We desire no move towards intercommunion which would be achieved through treating our differences superficially', etc., was in contradiction with the recommendation made in paragraph B of Part IV and proposed that the latter should therefore be removed.

PROF. A. M. RAMSEY (Church of England) said that the report usefully made clear that the World Council was not to be confused with the Church or with a Church and so could not itself celebrate the Eucharist; but that in Part V, last paragraph but one, the phrase 'a minister who, as a minister of the Church Universal' implicitly contained an ecclesiology which would not be universally held in the World Council. So far the World Council had succeeded in avoiding making such presuppositions, so that that phrase needed further examination.

He considered that paragraphs (1) and (2) under B in Part IV were misleading with regard to the practice of Anglican Churches, since although it was true that bishops allowed open communion services under certain circumstances there was a great deal of variety of practice in different parts of the Anglican Communion.

DR. R. E. NELSON (American Baptist Convention) wished for the insertion of a footnote, if possible early in the document, to say: 'In most Baptist Churches, the term "ordinance" is used rather than "sacrament".'

DR. J. A. JOHNSON (Coloured Methodist Episcopal Church, U.S.A.) wished more emphasis to be given to the assertion that loyalty to Christ must always come before loyalty to denomination, and THE REV. FARID AUDEH (Evangelical Synod of Syria

and Lebanon) said we must remember that Judas was at the Last Supper and that the Lord allowed him to participate, which should make us hesitant to debar from the Lord's Table anyone who would be present.

DR. NEVILE DAVIDSON (Church of Scotland) wished that the report was a clearer call to go forward on the way of the Cross and of sacrifice, for the Churches were looking to us to give a great lead in this matter, and to stress the costliness of the path back to union.

PRINCIPAL H. B. AMSTUTZ (Methodist Church in South East Asia) considered that the report was a magnificent document, carrying us a great step forward. The new notes sounded in paragraph (2) in A of the Introduction reminded him of his experience of communion services attended by thousands from all confessions whilst he was a prisoner of the Japanese during the war.

MR. J. M. ROSS (Presbyterian Church of England) questioned whether there were real distinctions between some of the things listed in the definitions in Part II on terminology, but THE BISHOP OF DERBY (Church of England) defended the definitions given in the report and explained the distinctions intended by them.

DR. SCHLINK (Evangelical Church in Germany) said that the proposal under B in Part IV could not really be described as 'a way forward' since Lutherans, Anglicans and Orthodox were to be found in opposition to it. We were trying to take the second step before the first. In the history of the Church, christology had been defined before the theologians arrived at ecclesiology. We were trying to speak about ecclesiology before we had settled christology, and he was convinced that the way of advance lay through serious common attention in the World Council to questions of christology.

ARCHBISHOP RINKEL (Old Catholic Church, Netherlands), commenting on the definition of the term Intercommunion in light of the agreement between Old Catholics and the Churches of the Anglican Communion, pointed out that this meant far more than mutual open communion.

THE REV. D. T. NILES (Methodist Church in Ceylon) spoke of the great value of paragraph B in Part IV, as lying in the fact that, at last, the majority had been allowed to state their conviction with the goodwill of the minority.

The President said that after such a discussion the conference would be in a chastened frame of mind. In the work of this section the exposed nerves of the Churches are to be found. He thought that the section should reconsider certain parts of the report, bearing in mind the contributions that have been made to the discussion from various points of view.

CHAPTER 8

A DAY OF REFRESHMENT AND WORSHIP

Sunday, August 24th

After ten busy days, the second Sunday falling within the limits of the conference was kept as free as possible from official engagements. In the morning, it was left open for delegates to worship where they would. Many, of course, attended the normal services of the Cathedral where, as in other churches of the city, the preacher of the day was a conference delegate.

On the Sunday afternoon, the Youth Council of the Swedish Churches had arranged a Youth Rally in a theatre at the nearby seaside resort of Malmö. Many young people, drawn not only from the surrounding countryside of Sweden but also from over the water, from Copenhagen, attended the rally—so many in fact that a large neighbouring church was used to accommodate an overflow meeting. Archbishop Brilioth went over to give the introductory address, and the other speakers were Professor Alexandre Schmemmann (Russian Orthodox Church of N. America), chairman of the youth delegation of the conference; Pastor Josiah Hove, an African from the Lutheran Church in Southern Rhodesia; the Rev. Russell Chandran of the Church of South India, and Dr. Carl Lund-Quist of the Lutheran World Federation. Meanwhile the delegates themselves who remained in Lund had been invited to a reception at the house of the Bishop of Lund and Mrs. Nygren, an act of hospitality deeply appreciated.

This is the point at which to record the gratitude of the whole conference for two other acts of hospitality. On Wednesday, August 20th, a fascinating tour of the surrounding countryside in buses was arranged by the Local Committee on behalf of the Swedish Church; and on August 22nd the city and parish of Lund entertained the conference delegates at a delightful dinner and reception in the Akademiska Föreningen.

THE CONFERENCE SERVICE

The only official event of the day was the Conference Service in the Cathedral at 7 p.m. All official delegates, for the most part in ecclesiastical or academic robes, assembled in the university building and walked in procession across the square of the Cathedral. Their Majesties the King and Queen of Sweden honoured this occasion with their attendance, a gesture much appreciated by the visiting delegates as well as by the citizens of Lund, who had gathered in large numbers to watch the procession—since few of them, in comparison with the demand, could take any fuller share. Nevertheless, the Cathedral was crowded in every corner. The great flight of steps leading to the High Altar was packed with people, and it is hard to imagine how a single extra person could possibly have been got into the building.

The service opened with a fine Cantata composed for the occasion by the cathedral organist, Dr. Josef Hedar, performed by solo, choir and orchestra. The form of the service which followed was:

Hymn 'Veni Creator'

Praise and Confession: led by Bishop Dr. W. Stählin

Hymn 'Thy sovereign grace and boundless love' (*Cantate Domino*, No. 98, vv. 2, 3)

Psalm 111, followed by a collect

Hymn 'Lord keep us steadfast in Thy word' (*Cantate Domino*, No. 55)

Lesson: St. Luke 18. 9-14, read by Dr. Douglas Horton

The Nicene Creed (sung by the choir, the congregation standing)

Sermon by the Archbishop of Upsala (printed below)

Hymn 'The Saviour's precious blood' (*Cantate Domino*, No. 50)

Prayer and Intercession: led by Dr. Newton Flew, concluded by the Lord's Prayer, said by each in his own tongue

Blessing: pronounced by Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira

SERMON AT THE CONFERENCE SERVICE BY
ARCHBISHOP Y. BRILIOTH

But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near in the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing

in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end. And he came and preached peace to you who were far off and peace to those who were near; for through him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father. So then you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but you are fellow-citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief cornerstone, in whom the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom you also are built into it for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit. (Eph. 2.13-22.)

This is a tremendous text, one of the greatest texts in the New Testament on the subject of the Church. Its richness is overpowering. The thoughts, the images it contains rend the forms of language and logic. It is impossible to reduce its content to a clear sequence of expression and ideas.

The Apostle was overwhelmed by the mighty things that he saw happening before his eyes, the development which he himself as an instrument in God's hand had been active in bringing about. The dividing wall of hostility had been broken down. Two worlds, two civilisations, two cultural traditions which had until now been absolutely alien, even hostile, to each other were being fused together through that new creative power that had come into the world—a power that made for unity, a power of reconciliation. The reconciliation of the individual to God, based on the sacrifice of the Cross, on the great act of atonement, had its counterpart in the new harmony between Jew and Gentile. The enmity was slain. The gospel of peace went forth into the world. A new living organism was being built up, like a mighty edifice, and yet a living thing, a new body. This was happening before the Apostle's eyes, partly through his own words and activities. This to him was the most marvellous event of his time. And he was not mistaken. In spite of the apparent insignificance of the Christian groups, in spite of the fact that the statesmen and wise people of the Roman world as yet hardly noticed what was going on in Ephesus, in Corinth, in Salonica, in Rome itself, here a power had been set in motion that could not be stopped, a power stronger than the legions of Caesar, more fraught with

potentialities than the mighty structure of the Empire. It broke down the isolation of Judaism; the law of commandments and ordinances was abolished. The history of revelation in Israel had reached its climax, and had put forth a fruit that belonged not to one people, but to mankind. There were no strangers any more, none privileged above the other. God's sovereign act in Christ Jesus had a universal scope. It was destined to be preached and offered to all the peoples of the earth. So the images crowd and jostle each other in these verses of the Epistle to the Ephesians. The edifice that was growing rather than being built derived its plan and its scope from Christ. All those who were built into the edifice, who were incorporated into the body, who belonged to the household of faith, to the community of believers, all who through Christ had access to the Father, all who in Christ had found their peace, had been brought into harmony with God's own being, with His creative activity.

Thus it appeared in the first century. It seemed possible to see, to understand what God was doing, in the building-up of the Christian Church. But what has happened since then, in the history of Christianity through the centuries? There have been erected new dividing walls, there has been enmity between Christians, who should have their unity, their peace in Christ. The growth of the Church is a wonderful thing to contemplate, but it is also a great tragedy. New walls have been built, new ordinances have taken the place or obscured the living power of the Gospel, of the Spirit of Christ. Certainly, the Spirit of Christ has never ceased to work in individuals—in every time, in every communion the accomplished work of atonement has been active, has been recognised through its fruits. The power of the Cross, the sharing in the great reconciliation has been verified. But very often it has seemed as if the external ecclesiastical organisation obscured rather than revealed the work of Christ. The harmonious, growing building has become a series of uncompleted structures for which divine authority has been claimed, in which the Gospel has been enclosed and fettered, which have separated from each other the friends of the Redeemer. And this perhaps is the crowning tragedy, that the divisions in Christendom have been caused by sincere disciples, who have felt constrained by their conscience, by their fidelity to the Lord, to go their own way, to build up their own Churches.

No wonder people in divers times, and also in the present time, have turned away from all that seemed to them purely external in the life of the Church. The mystics in all ages have felt estranged from the external ordinances, and have taken refuge in the inner sanctuary of the soul—in the ‘interior castle’, where the soul has communion with the Saviour, there everything else is of little or no importance. ‘*Er, nur er*’—‘He, He alone’—was the confession of Zinzendorf. Many of you will remember the famous phrase in Newman’s *Apologia* where he speaks of his youthful conversion and how he found rest ‘in the thought of two and two only absolute and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my creator’. There are many sayings in the writings of the great mystics that express this sense of union with God in Christ. There is definite continuity between them and the revival movements in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that have their roots in pietism. Johann Arndt belongs to this tradition, and there have been in recent times many in Lutheran Churches who have found nourishment for their souls in this ‘True Christianity’ and in the ‘Garden of Paradise’. There are to-day in many countries and Churches those who have been disappointed by the external forms of traditional Christianity, and who have considered one thing alone to be necessary—to meet the Saviour, to be in Him, to experience that peace which He alone can give to the faithful soul: When we catalogue and discuss our agreements and disagreements we often forget this dividing line, which runs through all communions, between the society, the churchmen, the organisers, the dogmatists, the liturgists on the one hand and the flock of quiet people in the land on the other, who do not care greatly for anything but this alone, to be with Jesus. The church history of the last century is a strange spectacle. Was it not in the groups of individuals who were brought together by their simple faith, by their common experience of life in Christ, in the society of the friends of Jesus, that the unity movement had its origin? The ecumenical development is hardly to be understood without the background of the missionary enterprise, of the Evangelical Alliance, of the Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., and not least the Student Movement.

Men who had been fostered in this unecclesiastical atmosphere again discovered the Church. How had the Bible been put in their hands? Is it not a gift of the Church, or rather of God through the

Church to the individual? The Church was prior to the Bible. It was discovered how it had pleased God to use in a wonderful way the external tools, the ordinances, the devotional forms, the organisation for His purpose—in spite of all human deficiencies with which they are tainted. The great edifice has not been raised—the one, complete temple, as a cathedral where every part is in harmony with the whole structure, and all witnesses to the unity of the Church, to the atonement that has been accomplished once for all. But still there is no getting away from the Church. Without it there can be no Christian life. Even if the complete temple is not there, but yet the building has been continued, the organism, which in spite of all we dare to call the Body of Christ, has not ceased to live. In each of the parts still something of the Spirit, of the mind of Christ has been revealed—something of the same miracle has been repeated. Perhaps even there has been some divine economy, there has been given to each of the sundry parts to exhibit some particular aspect of the fullness of Christ—to the one the intimate communion of Christian brethren, to another the burning love of the Saviour, to the third the eager will to work in His service, to the fourth the great vision, the apprehension of the eternal verities. And at the same time the old foundations in some parts of the world seem menaced, and human erections fall, yet the Body of Christ is growing over the whole globe. We have been reminded of this fact during these days, and in the whole ecumenical movement. One of the strongest impressions for many from a meeting such as ours will perhaps be the fact that the Gospel has called people of every land and every race, made them all members of the household of God, given them access to the Father, and poured into human souls of different structures, from different cultural traditions, the peace of Christ—that the Christian message is interpreted with new confidence, that it lives in new freshness amongst peoples on whom we used to look almost as the Jew looked upon the Gentiles. It has been a prejudice amongst many that the Gospel has been considered as an export from the West. But in many cases it seems that those on whom we looked as being afar are really nigh, that they put the Western countries to shame. Is not here the experience from Apostolic times repeated? When the Gospel is allowed to operate in its purity, then the dividing walls are broken down, and the message of atonement meets with response in every human heart

into which it really penetrates. So there is still a building up, a growing of the body of Christ, wonderful in our eyes. It has pleased God, in spite of all, to use the weak and divided Church.

Here is the problem that confronts us—the mystery which we but dimly perceive. To be near to Christ, to be in Him, that surely is important above everything. But this being in Christ cannot be realised in some secret enclosure of the life of the soul; it has an indissoluble relation to the external life of the Church, which has been born out of the historic act of God in Christ; it is built, in all its various forms, upon the Apostles and Prophets, with Christ as its cornerstone. No faith can be without some order. God uses the Church in its poverty and disunion in order to join new members to the body of Christ, and as means of His Spirit. So this question is pressed upon us: have our thoughts about the activity of God been too narrow, too human—have we imagined an ideal of our own which does not fit in with the plan of God? Would He be willing to use also our disunion, which seems to us unbearable, for His purpose? Has He perhaps laid the foundations of His temple wider than we imagined? Perhaps we are only in the early phase of the history of the Church. Perhaps He is at work on hidden ways also in this troubled and bewildering time. Perhaps He even may have some use for our little conferences, our very human enterprises, if we are careful to listen to His word and faithfully labour in our near and obvious tasks.

But when we see something of the vastness of His work, when we dimly perceive that He is even now acting in order to realise something of that of which the text speaks, we have to be very humble and not pretend to understand His ways. He may span the vaults of His cathedral wider and higher than human master-builders can attempt or imagine. The completion of the work we must leave to Him entirely, be it that it should please Him to bring it to fulfilment in history or reserve it for the new aeon, for the world to come. But we should be anxious to listen to His words. We should be grateful if He deigns to use us in some measure as His collaborators—use perhaps also our mistakes—for the attaining of ends that are hidden to us. And we should try to be very patient, remembering that while He can fill a human life, can fill a passing moment, with eternity, yet a thousand years 'in his sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night'.

But we may then hope that He will let us in faith see something of the correspondence between the work of redemption on Calvary and our own salvation, and also the building up of the Church of God. And we shall then—under all restlessness and tribulation—experience that in Him alone is our peace. And it shall be made clear that nothing is more important than to be in Him, and that only as His servants are in Him, the work for the unity of His Church can go forward.

To Him alone, who is our peace and our righteousness, in whom is our eternal hope, be all honour and glory.

Amen.

CHAPTER 9

HARVEST



The draft reports already reproduced in Chapter 7 had been preceded by preliminary section reports, which were simply read over to the conference by the Chairmen of the several sections at a plenary session on August 21st, Dr. Hodgson giving a composite report for the three sections dealing with the Church, and Bishop Lilje and Dr. Payne dealing with the reports on Ways of Worship and Intercommunion. The purpose of this procedure had been to give the conference as a whole some indication of the lines which the separate sections were developing. The draft reports printed in Chapter 7 and the debate on them there recorded had afforded the sections guidance from the whole conference for their final work of re-drafting. This took place in section meetings on the morning of Tuesday, August 26th, and by that evening the conference was ready to begin the work, in plenary session, of drawing together all its discussion in sections and committees into the Report which it was convened to issue and with which this volume begins. This record must now survey the proceedings of the closing days and their achievements.

Tuesday Afternoon, August 26th

This session was largely occupied with discussing a point in the draft Preface. The description, in the draft, of how Chapter II, *Christ and His Church* (v. pp. 17ff.) came to be written had given some delegates the impression that it was considered to be less completely the work of Section I as a whole than Chapter III, and so to have less authority. In fact, all that had been at stake was a matter of procedure. A small group had been invited by the rest of the section to draft for them a statement on the relation between Christ and His Church, and had adjourned to Bishop Nygren's house to do so. But the result of their work had later been submitted to the whole section and accepted by them, so

that its status was exactly the same as that of the rest of their report. As such it would be submitted to the whole conference for acceptance. The reference to Chapter II in the Preface was therefore re-drafted, omitting the description of the procedure through which it originated, and drawing attention only to the way in which it might be considered 'an advance on previous Faith and Order Conference Reports', viz. that it 'does not record agreements and disagreements on subjects at present dividing the Churches, but seeks to initiate a theological study of the biblical teaching about the relation between Christ and the Church'; and expressing the belief that this attempt 'to pass beyond the consideration of our immediately apparent disagreements and to explore the underlying theological problem provides a fitting introduction to the rest of the Report, and opens up fertile lines of further study both by the World Council's continuing Commission on Faith and Order and in the Churches themselves' (v. p. 12).

DR. RALLA RAM (United Church of North India) thought that a separate chapter should be devoted to the non-theological factors which entered so much into church relations. Those who came from the Younger Churches were particularly conscious of the way in which geographical and other circumstances had helped to produce a divided Church.

MR. J. M. ROSS (Presbyterian Church of England) proposed that a paragraph might instead be inserted in the Preface to say that, in addition to the three reports mentioned in the first paragraph, the conference had been deeply conscious of the so-called non-theological factors, and that references to them might be found at many points in the Report.

DR. HODGSON suggested that the conference might wait to see how far the subject of social and cultural factors was in fact discussed in the revised section reports, and then decide whether it wished also to add a paragraph to the Preface calling attention to them.

A note was inserted in the final text of the Preface which reads:

The bearing on the problem of unity of social, cultural, political, racial and other so-called 'non-theological' factors was hardly as much as mentioned at Lausanne in 1927. At Edinburgh in 1937 some attention was paid to it in one section of the conference. Since then there

has been an increasing realisation of its importance, and as part of the preparation for this Conference a group was convened to consider it at the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, Switzerland, in November 1951. Its report, *Social and Cultural Factors in Church Divisions*, was not assigned to any particular section of our Conference, but its influence was felt throughout, as may be seen especially in Chapters III, IV and VI. Together with the documents mentioned above we would commend to the Churches the further study of this report (v. pp. 12-13).

At the end of the debate METROPOLITAN JUHANON MAR THOMA spoke to the conference:

I should like to say a few words on the discussion in general. I speak from a tradition quite different from any represented here. We are remote from the main currents of Christian thought of the East or of the West. Our Church remains unaffected by the christological controversies of the early centuries or by the doctrinal differences that led to the confessional loyalties of Europe. A good deal of the discussion seems to me to be the attempt to define our own confessional loyalties rather than what is common property. Theology and christology must be related to life and experience. Otherwise we shall be like the man who, when asked by his friends whether he didn't find it difficult to remember the dates of important events in history, replied that he could remember the dates very easily, but found it hard to remember the events which had taken place on those dates, to associate the dates with events in history. We must associate theology with the life of society.

I have felt too that we have been trying to find words and phrases to cover up our differences. But we are brought here to try to understand one another. My fear still remains—discussions on theological matters may not bring about the oneness which the World Council seeks. But two things might help us to go forward. First, we should look back to the early centuries of the Church and the Ecumenical Creeds which are the agreements that unified that Church. The early fathers had different views of the sacraments and of the Church, but they were still united. Secondly, we must look forward and see what is at the turn of the road. There we see certain ideological forces which threaten everything we hold dear. In Faith and Order discussion these two things should be given their rightful places. Theologians must look at problems from the common man's point of view.

Wednesday, August 27th

At the morning session, the conference turned to the main body of the Report. The President suggested that the procedure of the Lausanne and Edinburgh Conferences should be adopted, which was to receive the reports and recommend them to the Churches for study, rather than formally to adopt them. It was agreed that this method should be followed. Each chapter of the final Report was put to the conference in plenary session and, after approved amendments had been made, was received *nemine contradicente*. On Thursday, August 28th, the President similarly put the Report as a whole to the vote of the conference, which received it *nemine contradicente*, and commended it to the Churches for consideration. The delegates representing the Orthodox Churches under the jurisdiction of the Oecumenical Patriarchate took part in the discussion, in expounding the Orthodox view both in section meetings and in plenary sessions, but took no part in the voting upon the reception of the Report.

CHAPTER II: CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH

DR. G. R. CRAGG (United Church in Canada) presented the draft of Chapter II, which was part of the report of Section I. Some members of the section had felt there was a certain degree of vagueness in the report, but this was in a sense inevitable and necessary, since the conference represented so wide a range of thought. A report which was too explicit might satisfy some but would thereby exclude others. After pointing out two textual corrections in the draft, he laid the report before the meeting for discussion.

Sundry amendments were suggested which failed to secure the support of the conference. Then DR. T. A. KANTONEN (United Lutheran Church in America) commented upon the recommendation that 'the doctrine of the Church should be treated in close relation to the doctrine of Christ'. He said:

None of us would deny the basic importance of this theme, but there is another great doctrine closely related to that of Christ and His Church, which has, I believe, been inadequately treated by this conference, and which should be included—the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. There are in the report incidental references to the Spirit, but pneumatology has nowhere received even the attention given to christology. Yet it is only through the

Spirit that Christ remains a living reality. It is the Spirit who creates unity and not we. By one Spirit we were all baptised into one body, says Paul. Our task is not to build unity but to build upon that great fact. So we should not take it for granted that we know all there is to be known about the Spirit. I therefore propose that the main theme of future work should be 'the doctrine of the Church, in close relation to the doctrine of Christ and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit'.

BISHOP NYGREN (Church of Sweden) said that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was implicitly included in the present form of wording, but it might be explicitly stated by adding ' . . . to the doctrine of Christ *and His Spirit*'.

THE REV. D. T. NILES (Methodist Church in Ceylon) quoted from the report the following sentence: 'Through His Spirit Jesus Christ Himself is present in His Church'. This must mean either that the second Person of the Trinity lives in the Church through the third Person of the Trinity, or that the risen Jesus Christ lives as a living being in His Church, which casts doubts on the resurrection of Christ. There was a confusion of expression here; was the document speaking of the second or the third Person of the Trinity? This attempt to get some kind of ontological existence for the Church within the Trinity should be closely watched.

DR. CRAGG explained that the capital 'S' for Spirit was supposed to indicate the third Person of the Trinity.

A vote was taken on the amendment of the recommendation in accordance with the form of words proposed by Dr. Kantonen, and the motion was carried.

Other suggestions were made which did not result in any amendment of the draft, and DR. CALHOUN (Congregational Christian Churches, U.S.A.) proposed some re-arrangement of the material, which was accepted. The President then put this chapter to the conference, which received it *nemine contradicente*.

CHAPTER III: CONTINUITY AND UNITY

PROFESSOR H. E. W. TURNER (Church of England) introduced the report of Section II, which comprises Chapter III of the final Report, *Continuity and Unity*.

The overlapping of material from various drafts led, at this

stage, to the adoption of the suggestion that a small editorial committee, composed of one person from each section with the conference Secretary, should be authorised to bring all the parts under review and tidy them into a more consecutive and coherent whole. Many minor, verbal points were then referred by the conference to this editorial committee.

DR. E. C. BHATTY (National Christian Council of India; Fraternal Visitor) said that the members of the Younger Churches had learnt a great deal about the denominations and their differences at this conference. They had also learnt with great satisfaction of the deep desire which existed for the unity of the Church. The discussion of differences between the denominations had given them some understanding of the complex theological problems which obstructed any decisive step towards church unity. However, he expressed concern that these denominational differences, so ably presented, would be made known to the world, and might hinder negotiations for church unity now in progress in the countries of the younger Churches. He wished that there could be more emphasis in the reports on agreements and their desire to go forward towards church unity. For the younger Churches, tradition and the differences they had inherited had been a mixed blessing. They had depended only upon the New Testament as their guide in the course of their negotiations. He thought the time had come for the World Council to convene a conference of the younger Churches so that they could discuss the problems of Faith and Order in the light of the work now in progress.

DR. J. WINTERHAGER (Evangelical Church in Germany) commented on the recommendation that there should be a wider observance of periods of corporate prayer for unity, pointing out that several such periods existed. He proposed that the recommendation should urge the responsible authorities to co-ordinate these different periods, and this proposal was agreed to by the conference.

The President then moved the reception of this report, and the motion was received *nemine contradicente*.

CHAPTER I: A WORD TO THE CHURCHES

BISHOP ANGUS DUN (Protestant Episcopal Church, U.S.A.) introduced this chapter. It had been prepared by the Committee

on Theme and Message, and was the draft of a proposed Message to the Churches. The intention had been to produce something brief and simple in expression and substance, in the hope that it might speak intelligibly to the membership of the Churches and to the ministry and clergy, and even beyond through the secular press, in a way readily understood. The draft ought therefore to be judged by its effectiveness as such a document.

The President explained that this document was on a different level from the Report proper. The idea was that, if approved, it should be released immediately at the end of the conference and be given to the press for publication.

The debate on this section of the Report was almost wholly concerned with proposed amendments to words and phrases which it would be tedious to follow in detail. But at the afternoon session on August 27th a text was finally agreed which is printed as Chapter I of the Report (see pp. 15f.), and which was immediately released, through the Press Committee of the conference, for world-wide publication.

CHAPTER IV: WAYS OF WORSHIP

THE REV. A. MARCUS WARD (Church of South India) presented the revised report on worship, drawing attention to certain verbal changes since it appeared in its first draft.

In the discussion, a number of further verbal amendments were moved from the floor of the house and accepted or rejected on a vote of the conference. It is unnecessary here to follow them in detail, though a comparison of the draft report in Chapter 7 with the final text in Part I of the volume would reveal the changes. However, there was clear evidence in this debate of some dissatisfaction with the traditional procedure, inevitable when the plenary meeting of a large conference has power to alter the phraseology adopted after much careful discussion by a smaller group within the conference. As one speaker pointed out, the words chosen in the section meeting had often been the result of protracted and careful debate, seeking to do justice not only to the thoughts of those who held a particular point of view, but also to the words in which that point of view would naturally be expressed. As documents are revised in plenary session, this careful balance is liable to be lost, since majority opinion seeks

for words more congenial to its outlook, and tends to overlook the original purpose of the wording as the expression of conflicting viewpoints. However, this difficulty would seem to be inherent in any procedure which seeks to make a report acceptable to a full conference whilst not providing the same time for careful discussion and choice of words as had been available in the smaller group. Whatever the defects of procedure, this section of the Report, like all the others, was finally received *nemine contradicente*.

CHAPTER V: INTERCOMMUNION

DR. E. A. PAYNE (Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland) introduced the revised report of this section, pointing out that all the suggestions made in the plenary discussion had been carefully weighed by the whole section and by the drafting committee, and he expressed the hope that if these suggestions had not always been accepted in detail their sponsors would appreciate that they had been carefully considered. The full text of the report as revised had been considered paragraph by paragraph by the whole section, and came before the conference as a unanimous report.

The President, in opening the meeting for discussion on the report, said how much he had been impressed by the careful work done by this section.

Again, many suggestions were made for verbal alteration, and, when it was evident that these served to express the intended meaning of the section more clearly, they were immediately accepted. In many other instances the Chairman of the section was able to satisfy the conference that the form of words proposed expressed a point of view within the section and the conference, which it would not be possible to express more adequately in the time available.

There was some discussion on Part IV of the report, dealing with recommendations regarding communion services at ecumenical gatherings. DR. L. E. COOKE (Congregational Union of England and Wales) proposed that these recommendations should not appear as part of the report itself, but be referred to the Working Committee of the Faith and Order Commission for continuing further study, lest the effect of passing them as recommendations should be prematurely to set the course of ecumenical

practice in these matters. DR. PAYNE replied that although the section had spent considerable time on the problems dealt with in Part IV, they were well aware of the difficulty of the issues involved, and he thought that the members of the section might be quite willing to adopt the course that Dr. Cooke suggested. However, PROFESSOR A. M. RAMSEY (Church of England) contended that it would be a great pity if this section of the report were given any lesser authority than the rest of it. What was important in this matter was not so much the direction and advice given on practical questions as the attempt to sort out the very difficult questions involved in the holding of communion services at ecumenical conferences. It was quite clear that this part of the report was the result of very patient and careful theological work in which diverse traditions had co-operated, and it would be the loss of a great opportunity if their conclusions were not to have the authority of endorsement by the whole conference. MR. D. T. NILES (Methodist Church in Ceylon), PRINCIPAL R. LENNOX (Presbyterian Church in Canada) and the BISHOP OF DERBY (Church of England) supported Professor Ramsey, and DR. VISSER 'T HOOFT (General Secretary, World Council of Churches) suggested that the recommendations should stand in the report, with the simple addition of a sentence at the end urging that 'further careful study of the principles underlying procedure at ecumenical conferences and institutions should be undertaken by the newly appointed Faith and Order Commission'. DR. COOKE expressed his readiness to allow the recommendations to stand in the Report if Dr. Visser 't Hooft's rider urging further study were also included. The Conference approved the addition of these words.

It was then possible for the President to put the whole of Chapter V to the conference, which received it *nemine contradicente*.

Plenary Session, Thursday Morning, August 28th

CHAPTER VI: WHERE DO WE STAND?

The final part of the Report to be received was that printed as Chapter VI: 'Where do we stand?' It was introduced by DR. G. R. CRAGG (United Church of Canada) as part of the material prepared by Section I. He pointed out that certain editorial

changes had been made in the original draft in order to make it fit properly as the concluding chapter of the Report. There were a few comments from the floor, some of which led to the acceptance of verbal changes, whereupon this final chapter was also put to the conference and received *nemine contradicente*.

At the same session a final revision of the Preface, which had been referred back for editorial re-drafting, was also received.

FAITH AND ORDER THEME FOR EVANSTON

BISHOP ANGUS DUN (Protestant Episcopal Church, U.S.A.) then presented the report of the Committee on the Faith and Order Theme for the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches, to be held at Evanston, U.S.A., in 1954. He said that Faith and Order would as a matter of course be greatly concerned with this Assembly; it had been decided some time ago by the World Council's Central Committee that a Faith and Order subject should take its place among the six subjects to be discussed at Evanston, and the present conference had been asked to decide on this theme. Conversations had taken place between the Executive Committees of the Faith and Order Commission and of the Central Committee, and a subject had been referred to the committee for which he was now reporting. That committee wished to recommend that the Faith and Order theme at Evanston should be 'Our Oneness in Christ and our Disunity as Churches'. They had thought it well, for the much wider constituency which would be represented at Evanston, to choose a subject which was broad and central to the whole membership of the World Council. We needed to confront this situation together and to explore the meaning of our oneness in Christ and our dividedness from each other. It would be the task of the Faith and Order Commission, through its Working Committee, to provide preparation for the consideration of this theme by a representative commission, which would work upon and develop suitable materials parallel to those being prepared for the other themes to be considered at Evanston. To assist any preparatory commission which might be set up, the Committee on Theme had sketched out some of the ground which they believed should be included, and if the conference approved of their suggestions they would be transmitted to the Commission for such use as it wished to

make of them. Bishop Dun then moved the acceptance of the subject

OUR ONENESS IN CHRIST AND OUR DISUNITY AS CHURCHES as the Faith and Order theme for the Evanston Assembly.

After a short discussion the Committee's suggestion was approved, and the further elaboration of the subject was later entrusted by the newly elected Commission, at its first meeting, to the members of its Working Committee and to the Secretariat.

THE REPORT OF THE YOUTH GROUP

A Youth Group (whose names are printed in Appendix 2, p. 335) had been carefully selected by the Youth Department of the World Council of Churches, and had been present in all plenary and section meetings of the conference. A report was presented on their behalf by MR. MORRIS WEST (Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland). In introducing their report, he said that, since they had been allowed to take part in the section meetings, they had not found it necessary to comment in detail upon the work of the sections, but rather to present their comments and frank feelings and impressions of the conference as a whole. They had been interested to note how closely the ideas and feelings of the delegates on the section reports paralleled their own.

YOUTH GROUP REPORT

Our first word must be one of gratitude to the Faith and Order Commission that we were invited to Lund not merely as a Youth Group but as a Youth Group within the Conference. We wish to express our appreciation that we have been treated as members of the Conference not only officially by virtue of the Constitution, but also by the individual conference members unofficially. We think that we have been able to make some 'youthful' contributions as individuals in the section meetings and now we submit for your acceptance our Group Report. The very full conference programme has made it impossible for us to meet daily as a Youth Group. However, we have been able to meet in small groups at various hours of the day and night, in varying places from the Grand Hotel downwards, and we offer this report which has been agreed upon by a full Youth Group meeting.

This Conference has taught us many things, and speaking in general terms we would single out three for mention here:

(a) *The growing understanding of, and respect for, the emphases of other confessions.* Before our introduction to the ecumenical movement we just did not know what the other man stood for—and so naturally we could not begin to understand his point of view. Now we have come to realise that in all traditions there is a sincerity of conviction and a richness of heritage which we have come to respect, and from which we can learn. One of our tasks is now to return to our own Churches and share the discoveries we have made.

(b) *The feeling of oneness which we experienced in worshipping together in this ecumenical setting.* We cannot over-estimate what this sharing in the devotional life of the Conference has meant to us and we feel that another of our tasks is to carry back to our Churches this spirit of devotional understanding.

(c) *The method and conduct of a conference such as this.* In the section and plenary sessions we have listened with interest to the discussions and we have learnt many things that we should do and some things that we should not do. If the opportunity is given to any of us to attend similar conferences in the future as delegates, we shall come with the invaluable experience of Lund behind us. This experience will help us to contribute more fully and wisely than would otherwise have been the case.

Having ourselves read and studied the preparatory Reports for the Conference we were disappointed to find in the Sections so much repetition of ground already covered and singular lack of reference to the work done. We did, perhaps, underestimate the difficulties and complexities of the present situation. We can also see that as the ecumenical movement comprehends more and more Churches with different emphases, the complexities may well, at first at any rate, increase.

Nevertheless we can appreciate and to a large extent share in the feeling of impatience which has been clearly manifested by the representatives of the younger Churches. It is a tragedy not to be able to present one Church when you are working in a 'mission field' situation. We can not only see this tragic situation but we can also feel it for ourselves. Those of us from the 'older' Churches are standing increasingly in a 'mission field' situation. Many of our group are concerned with work among young people and there can be no doubt at all but that we face young people who are more than ever under the influence of the secular world. We have met and do meet them in all sorts of situations, in church youth work, in the barrack room, in the factory, in the office, and time and again we are challenged on the tragedy of the divided Church. We would emphasise this point for two reasons:

(a) Because we feel the growing urgency of the situation, not only in the younger Churches but also in the older Churches. There can be no doubt that in the next few years the whole Church will find herself faced to an ever increasing degree by this 'mission field' situation. The urgent challenge of this situation cannot and must not be disregarded.

(b) Because we would suggest that there is a form of unity inherent in this situation, a unity of witness. It is basically the same Lord to whom we witness. In England, for example, when an Anglican and a Baptist find themselves side by side at a factory bench the difference of view on episcopacy tends to recede and the fact of witnessing to one Christ comes to the forefront. In saying this we are not making light of doctrinal differences, nor are we trying to bypass them, nor are we being naïve. We agree that the witness would be even better if they agreed on church order. We are simply stating a fact of unity of witness which many of us have experienced in practice to a remarkable degree in the past difficult years and which tends sometimes to be forgotten in a conference such as this. In connection with this unity of witness we should like to mention that we, as a Youth Group in the conference, have not always been able to see how the theological discussion has been related to the situation of the people living outside the walls of this University. It seems to us that our unity in witness demands a re-thinking of theology to make it relevant in the context of the world of to-day. Christian faith cannot be expressed in a vacuum, and we have to connect our understanding of Christian doctrine with the problems of everyday people. We do not suggest that theology should be subordinated to the fluctuating demands of human nature, but its content must be presented in a manner congruent to the realities of the world of to-day.

In answer to the question: 'Where do we go from here?' we would make three points:

(a) We believe that we can discern in the history of the ecumenical movement in general, and of the Faith and Order movement in particular, distinct stages of advance. First there was the new experience of coming together and getting to know one another. Next, with the growing realisation of the complexity of the differences which separate us came a strengthening of denominational consciousness. Once again the denominations came together to discuss, and as a result there was a clear statement of agreements and disagreements. We feel that this is the stage at which we stand now. The question arises as to whether there is any point in simply continuing to discuss and in tabulating our agreements and disagreements. While we agree that it is necessary for any misunderstandings still existing on matters of denominational belief to be cleared up, and while we agree that it is necessary for the question

of terminology and the understanding of it to be examined, we would suggest that the time has come for a new development in the Faith and Order work to begin.

It is obvious that within the ecumenical movement all denominations are not divided from each other to the same degree nor by the same reasons. Ultimately, of course, the cleavage is between the Catholics and the Protestants—to use the terminology of Amsterdam. It seems to us, however, that the true situation would become much clearer if the denominations of the same type came together to study the reasons which still divide them. We are aware that discussions between such denominations are held from time to time, but we suggest that this study might take place within the framework of the Faith and Order Commission. By this means the reasons, both theological and non-theological, which at present divide, for example, the American Free Churches, might become clearer. This suggestion would challenge each denomination to face up to the inescapable question of their conception of the *Una Sancta*, a question which we feel must be everywhere realistically faced and honestly answered.

(b) The study of each other's emphases and methods must clearly also continue. We would like, however, to suggest that such a study be conducted along the lines suggested by Dr. Hodgson in his address introducing the reports of the Theological Commissions. The question Dr. Hodgson asked was this: 'Is God now calling us: (i) to see other people's methods and emphases, and (ii) to try to see whether these differing emphases and methods, when rightly understood, may not all rightly have place in one united Church?' We would like the approach to the problem by the various Churches to be not 'Why is it we don't want this particular emphasis or method?' but rather 'What can we learn from it of positive value?' There are surely many things which have been rejected by denominations simply because they have approached the problem with the first question in mind rather than the second.

(c) Finally, we suggest a renewed emphasis on the study of the Bible, in a serious attempt to discern the true biblical basis of the Church. Very much attention has been paid to the conception of the Church as the Body of Christ, but such living New Testament pictures as the Bride of Christ, Temple of Christ, New Israel, Royal Priesthood, and others also demand our attention. All of these figures enrich the conception of the Church and consideration of all of them seems to us to be necessary for a true understanding of the New Testament Church.

We affirm, also, that it is impossible to study the Church in the New Testament without also studying the vital relationship which the Holy

Trinity has with the Church. We cannot speak of one person of the Trinity without implying the other two. God the Father is the Creator of the Church, God the Son is the Lord and Head of the Church, God the Holy Spirit is the Preserver and Life of the Church.

This then is our Report, which we offer to this Conference. We believe that although the work of the Conference in Lund is nearly over, the work of the Lund Conference in the four corners of the earth, to which we shall soon be scattered, is about to begin. We cannot tell what the ultimate result will be. That is known to God alone. We realise, however, that as we part our task is once again to lay ourselves open to the working of the Holy Spirit that He may lead us into all truth and to follow fearlessly and resolutely as He leads us along new paths. We should never forget that we are a 'Pilgrim Church' on a journey, and that to refuse to follow where God leads is utterly wrong, nor should we forget that the end of the journey is the Supper in the presence of God.

The President thanked Mr. West and the youth group for their report, and for their presence at the conference. He thought that their report had a less rebellious spirit than some to which he had listened, and hoped that this might mean that the ideas of the older members of the conference were not out-of-date.

He then informed the conference that many members were leaving that day, and although it was not possible to speak of them all he felt he must mention the departure of Dr. Leiper. The conference would wish to thank him for the services he had rendered for so many years, and to express their good wishes for the new work on which he was embarking. This was heartily endorsed by the meeting.

ELECTION OF FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION

The list of nominations for the new Faith and Order Commission was presented to the conference. After two changes in the list as proposed by the Business Committee, the new Commission was elected as named in Appendix 7, pp. 366ff.

REPORT OF PRESS COMMITTEE

DR. C. P. MOREHOUSE (Protestant Episcopal Church, U.S.A.) presented the report of the Press and Publicity Committee.¹ He

¹ The text is published in Appendix 4 on pp. 352ff.

said that the committee had done all they could to bring the proceedings of the conference before the world, but they hoped that the delegates and visitors would make the work of the conference known as widely as possible when they returned to their homes.

The President thanked Dr. Morehouse for the report, and for the work done by the committee and the staff. He thought the attention the press had given to the conference was remarkable.

STATEMENT FROM REPRESENTATIVES OF THE YOUNGER CHURCHES

The following statement had been drawn up by certain representatives of younger Churches present at the conference, and was, with the President's permission, circulated to all present. It is here reproduced for permanent record.

We, the representatives of the younger Churches present at this Conference from lands where church union negotiations have either been completed or are in progress, desire, if we may, to say a word in love to those who have been used of God to send us Holy Baptism.

1. We are now much more fully alive to our responsibilities and opportunities in our own lands. Far more than any material gift, we need from you the gift of prayerful understanding and trustfulness.

2. We desire church unity primarily because it is the will of our Lord. In this matter the parent Churches must resist the temptation to measure everything by their own standards. We well realise that the hope for a united Church lies in maintaining all those elements of Faith and Order which were the fundamentals of the Church before that unity was broken by the sins of men who could not maintain those elements in a just balance. As we go forth, under the Holy Spirit, to restore that balance, let it be remembered that unprecedented situations cannot be dealt with in every detail by the precedents of church history: and further, where all the fruits of visible union cannot be had at the inception of a scheme of union, our friends in the West must, for the peace of the Church, apply a self-denying ordinance to themselves in certain particulars where they expect more of us than they are ready to demand of themselves.

3. Also, we would plead with you to use your influence to encourage similar schemes of union amongst yourselves and your kindred overseas so that the inevitable crop of anomalies on the way to union would be reduced. While we appreciate the place given to Asia to occupy in such creative tasks, we ourselves must guard our honour against the possibility of our services to Christian unity being mistaken for a by-product of Asian nationalism. Many doubts and hesitations may be

resolved if a number of similar schemes, affecting a wider variety of peoples and continents, could be brought to fruition about the same time. Synchronisation, were this possible, would greatly reduce the number of anomalies and confusions.

4. May we also bear witness to our experience under God as we have worked together as Churches actually negotiating for organic church union, and also as Churches which have already come into being as a result of such union.

(i) We have seen how, as we resolutely held to that on which we were united and sought to give form to such unity, God Himself drew nigh to us and fulfilled among us His promise that they who do His will shall learn of the doctrine.

(ii) We have also experienced the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the way in which He has led us into greater wholeness of truth as we, having reached the limits of discussion, ventured in faith, trusting one another, into life together in a united Church.

(iii) We can testify with gladness that we have seen the vision of a Church in which the episcopal, presbyteral and congregational elements have each their structural place in the life of a united Church; and we humbly seek to bear this testimony before you and share our vision with you if you so desire it.

In our different lands, we are God's people, called by Him, and commissioned by Him to win our several nations for Jesus Christ. We must obey Him as we can, trusting that He will confirm our obedience, overrule our mistakes, and perform His holy will. Brethren, pray for us, as we pray for you.

Signed by:

A. THAKUR DAS, Pakistan.

D. T. NILES, Methodist Church, Ceylon.

AUGUSTINE RALLA RAM, United Church of Northern India.

J. R. CHANDRAN, Church of South India.

DAVID WILSON, Methodist Church, Ceylon.

P. D. DEVANANDAN, Church of South India.

FARID AUDEH, Evangelical Churches in Lebanon and Syria.

AUBERT RABENORO, Reformed Church, Madagascar.

RAJAH B. MANIKAM, Tamil Lutheran Church, India.

E. C. BHATTY, United Church of Northern India.

TAKESHI MUTO, United Church of Christ in Japan.

ERNEST JOHN, Cambridge Brotherhood of the Ascension, Delhi.

LAKDASA KURUNAGALA, Church of Ceylon.

Closing Plenary Session, 4.45 p.m., Thursday, August 28th

The President invited Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira to make a statement to the conference. The Archbishop said:

Most Reverend President,

The delegation of the Oecumenical Patriarchate to this conference takes the honour and pleasure to thank warmly Your Grace and all the members of the Lund Conference for so kindly and respectfully sending to our spiritual Head the greeting of the conference.

Then we express our thanks also for the consideration that was given and brotherly understanding granted to our attitude, according to which we did not discuss at all dogmatical matters and we did not vote for any resolutions taken here. I declare once more that this does not in the least mean an unfriendly gesture. On the contrary, we answered gladly to any questions concerning our faith, and we were praying to God that more spiritual light be granted to all those whose opinions are away from the meaning of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church according to our faith. We are convinced that this conference has gone some steps closer to its purpose concerned. God will not cease His precious guidance, so that in the next conference much of the gap which divides Christendom will be filled.

God bless all of you, dear brothers, and the work of such conferences.

The President thanked Archbishop Athenagoras on behalf of the conference for his statement, and declared that the presence of the Oecumenical Patriarchate's delegation had been a great joy to the conference.

At this stage the President reminded the conference that, although they had received the Report section by section, it was now his duty to put it to them as a whole. This he did, and the Report was received *nemine contradicente*.

He then gave a brief report on the first meeting of the Commission elected that morning, which had held its first session during the afternoon. He said that the Commission had been kind enough to elect him as its Chairman. It had elected Dean C. T. Craig as its Vice-Chairman. As the Chairman of the Working Committee it had elected Mr. Oliver Tomkins, and it had elected twenty-five of its members as its Working Committee. It had also recommended the appointment of Dr. J. Robert

Nelson as the whole-time Secretary for Faith and Order. It had further made some recommendations to the Working Committee with regard to subjects that it might take up, in the first instance those which had been recommended by the conference. The Working Committee had also held its first short meeting that afternoon.

BISHOP TERENCE POLADIAN, of the Armenian Catholicate of Cilicia, asked the permission of the President to address a few words to the conference. He said:

At this closing session of the conference I want to say a few words. I have felt very happy at being present at this conference, for I have seen that after centuries of separation attempts are being made to unite the divided members of Christ's Body, the Church. In these times of our distress, the Churches all over the world should have unity of action. In this conference I realise that the Christian Churches, although divided by dogma, rite and orders, can come together, work together, and more fully understand each other. When inspired in this way by mutual love and co-operation the Church will be strengthened for its tasks. This conference teaches the Churches that they should cease to stand against each other. On the contrary, as members of the same body, they should help one another by mutual understanding and love, and work for the preparation of the Gospel. Through the guidance of the Holy Spirit each one of us must go out to his people and preach love and unity without prejudice. Unity among the Churches will also be a means of achieving unity among the nations, for we are all the children of our Father in heaven. The Holy Church of Armenia is ready to labour for the realisation of this high ideal, i.e. love and unity between all nations. The seed sown through these conferences will in due time bring forth its fruit.

The President then called upon the Bishop of Derby to express the thanks of the conference to its various benefactors. The BISHOP OF DERBY said:

I have been assigned the honour and privilege of presenting a motion in which I am confident that the whole conference will be unanimous. I wish that I had the tongues of angels and the eloquence of Demosthenes, to do justice to the theme, but I want to propose a vote of thanks to a great many persons who have done everything in their power to make our time here so delightful,

and have in so many ways contributed to our comfort and spiritual refreshment. First, the Church of Sweden, the host Church on this occasion. In every conceivable way they have made us welcome, and have sought to make us happy. We thank them in particular for the excursion they provided for us, and I should like to ask you, Mr. President, to convey the thanks of those who went on that excursion to the charming châtelaine and her family, and to all others who took part in the organisation and carrying out of that afternoon's pleasure. Secondly, we wish to thank the University of Lund and its janitor. Thirdly, the parish and city of Lund for their hospitality at dinner. Fourthly, our gratitude must be expressed to the restaurant which fed us so well. Fifthly, we would thank also the Local Committee in Lund, who have been responsible for the arrangements of this conference, for all the labour entailed. Lastly, we thank most warmly the conference staff, the ushers, stenographers and interpreters.

THE PRESIDENT: I have received kindness and encouragement at this conference far beyond what I deserve or expected. The fact that this conference has on the whole been successfully carried through is largely due to our valued friend, Mr. Oliver Tomkins. I wish to thank Mr. Tomkins personally for his encouragement and counsel during several years. It is a great satisfaction for us all to know that, although Mr. Tomkins will, from the beginning of next year, enter upon a new task as Principal of Lincoln Theological College—and I should like to congratulate the students of that college—it is of satisfaction to us all to know that in spite of this Mr. Tomkins will still be in our movement, in the most important post of Chairman of the Working Committee. I should now like to refer to the Theological Secretary, Dr. Leonard Hodgson, who has served the Faith and Order movement for nineteen years, and through his fidelity has enabled it to pass through one of its most difficult crises. By his learning and willingness to serve he has given to the movement something of depth and stability. Though he will leave his official position at the end of the year, he will still be with us in spirit, and his interest in the work will not be diminished. When the history of Faith and Order is recorded, his name will be inscribed there among the very first. The Associate Secretary in America, Dr. Floyd Tomkins, has also been one of the most faithful friends and servants of the movement, and a link with the past through his connection with Bishop

Brent. You may not all realise how much work he has done behind the scenes at this conference at many tasks, and we owe him a great debt of gratitude. You will all be glad to know that, as far as can be foreseen, he will remain as one of the secretaries of Faith and Order.

The Lund Conference, so eagerly expected by many, looked forward to by some with anxiety, thus comes to an end and now belongs to history. We cannot judge what the results will be, nor of the quality and importance of the reports and decisions, but I think some very honest work has been done, not least in the sections. We should not overlook the importance of the changes in the constitution which have been passed, and which mean the definite incorporation and integration of Faith and Order into the World Council, which may mark the beginning of a new epoch, and I think there are many signs that there will be great tasks for Faith and Order in the future. That has been indicated already at a meeting held to-day of the new Commission.

We have great reason for thankfulness for the past days, during which we have really conferred, really been together. Our frank and open discussions have been marked by a genuine friendliness and spirit of togetherness. That atmosphere of friendliness, which has been experienced by many, has been one of the distinct characteristics of the conference, and of great value. It is perhaps not too bold to say that we have been in these days in the one Church, in spite of our divisions, and the spirit that has pervaded our deliberations is no small thing. We may hope that this spirit of togetherness will radiate to all the Churches and to all countries, through the delegates, and may be a factor of importance in the whole world for Christianity. None of us is committed to every word in the Report, but still we are committed to impress upon the Churches the need for thorough study both of the Report and the other material. That service is most urgently needed now in order to make the cause of church unity known in the parishes and in our Churches. We all know how much remains to be done in that respect.

The Lund Conference thus comes to its close. We should above all give thanks to God for all He has given us, and that it has pleased Him to use us, at least in some measure, in His service.

BISHOP ANGUS DUN said that it was no oversight on the part

of the Bishop of Derby that he had not mentioned one whom they all wished to thank—one who was present with them and whom they wished to signal out specially—their President. (The delegates rose to their feet and applauded.) He said they were deeply grateful for the integrity, wisdom and courtesy with which Archbishop Brilioth had served them, and they believed that he had so served them because he had all their Churches in his heart, his understanding reached across their divisions and he was an ecumenical person. It was for that service and for what he was that all the members of the conference wished to honour him.

The meeting then rose for the members to attend the Closing Service in the Cathedral.

THE CLOSING SERVICE

After the singing of the hymn 'Thine is the glory', Dr. Douglas Horton preached the sermon which is printed below. There followed a collect and the Lord's Prayer: a Lesson, from John 15.1-8, and then the form of the Methodist Covenant Service, as printed in *Venite Adoremus I*, which was conducted by the Rev. O. S. Tomkins.

SERMON BY THE REV. DR. DOUGLAS HORTON

The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever. (Rev. 11.15).

The seventh trumpet of the Apocalypse has already sounded. On almost every page of our report we have declared it. We have celebrated it in many acts of praise in this very house of God. Now the time has come for us to ask if the song of triumph it evoked has become part of us, part of our very being. If our hearts were opened, would there be found inscribed on their walls:

The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever.

If Christ does already rule the world, this means *judgment* upon all feebleness of our response to His reign. When He calls for a living body in His Church and we give Him an Ezekiel's valley of disjointed members, when He desires a shining instrument of love, a symbol of His oneness among us, and we return Him

weak fragments of mutual unsympathy, will the Judge of all the world regard us as an obedient people?

That He will make effective His judgment upon us, who can doubt? The six trumpets have already sounded and are sounding. We are going from this place of security and relative peace into a world shivering with the clangour of change and destruction. Who will prophesy that a third of the sea will not become blood? With stars that we have regarded as fixed falling in various parts of the heaven surrounding us, who will say that the Lord has no controversy with the nations? With ignorance brooding over many peoples, who will hold that the sun cannot be partly blotted out? It is a world where demonic forces darkly clash into which we are returning—and these are the agents of God's judgment to destroy all that is unwell within us. The Assyrian becomes the rod of His anger: He maketh the wrath of men to praise Him.

These forces are capable of destroying us only when we succumb to and become part of them, partaking of their disunity. The gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church, the spiritually sound body of Christ—but the gates of hell can laugh at a motley company of disparate denominations masquerading as the Church. Disunion, mutual suspicion, subtle antagonism—these are the marks of those already possessed in part by Satan. Let us not think that we can accept as our own the spirit of the world and yet escape the consequences. God has the centuries in which to work His will. If we remain as we are, He will get Him a new people, leaving the parts of this false Church that call 'Lord, Lord' but worship really their own proud idols to go the way of the devotees of Apollo and Diana, and slip into oblivion.

If you are content, as your offering to Christ, to leave the Church as it is, broken and so the more easily to be further broken by the surging forces of this age—God's own forces—let me warn you against going to the altar of your Church in future. He is not a dead God who reveals Himself in Christ. You cannot lock Him with peculiar interpretations within the Bible. You cannot lull Him to sleep with languorous and mystical liturgies. You cannot bury Him beneath the altar nor shout Him down by much preaching. When you go to any place where the cross is lifted up, the Christ upon it will wrench a hand loose from the nails of the beam and in an appealing gesture ask: 'Are you really willing to give Me this substitute for a Church in return for what

I did for you?' Take the wings of the morning: make your bed in Sheol: at least try to keep out of His sight: His eyes are full of judgment—judgment which will be exercised because

The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever.

But suppose we say: 'O Lord, the way is difficult. The task is planetary in dimensions, long in duration—and our lives are brief. We have striven to separate ourselves from the world's disunity and do continue so to strive. We ask forgiveness and Thy blessing.' Then behold a miracle. The word of judgment mellows into the word of salvation. It becomes a veritable fountain of new life. If Christ is Lord, then what have we to fear?

We shall go from this place as persons who, though they have not accomplished all they hoped to, nevertheless made an honest attempt and now tender it as their gift to Christ, who judges not according to our works. The point at which we have arrived is not so important as that we are determined we shall reach. And Christ becomes a deathless companion in our endeavour.

As we go out into the world we go not as the fearful nor the fugitive but as missionaries of Christ's Church. The apocalyptic song of certain triumph ringing in our ears lends courage to our hearts. The victorious Leader is with us. Each of us has upon him in faith the touch of the divine purpose, being in a curious way swept into the very plan of salvation. Our minds and hands consecrated to Christ may become part of His *Kerygma*.

The world into which we enter will lie before us then as a battleground. It is an arena of judgment, to be sure, but with *Christus Victor* it is a field of opportunity. Its demonic forces can be challenged. Instead of denominations on the defensive, confused by the invading disunity of the world, let us take arms—love, joy, peace, long suffering, and all the other fruits of the Spirit—against that world, and devote ourselves to the healing of its divisions.

This we can do only by dedication to the healing of our own divisions. If international society lies at the side of the Jericho road broken and half dead, the Church can give it little help if she lies on the other side of the road broken and half dead herself. But let her come to life—visibly, palpably. Let the separate members be joined in an actual body. Let the sinews and flesh come up upon them. Let blood begin to course through the new

arteries. Let the Church be herself. Let her stand in her complete beauty—and in that end the world will believe.

When we go back to the altars of our Churches it will be in order to devote ourselves anew, as we do here to-night, to the winning of a battle not yet won, which requires blood and sweat from every one of us, to the building of a Church on its human side which will be less unworthy of its divine Founder, and withal to take strength from the song which we can already hear:

The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever.

APPENDIX I

TIME-TABLE AND DAILY PROGRAMME OF THE CONFERENCE

(Note: This differs from the one printed in the Conference Handbook to take account of the changes from that version which were agreed to by the Conference and put into effect.)

★

Friday, August 15

- 20.00 hrs. OPENING SERVICE. *Cathedral*
Leader: Bishop Ivan Lee Holt (Methodist Church,
U.S.A.)
Preachers: Rt. Rev. Lakdasa De Mel (Bishop of
Kurunagala, Ceylon)
Generalsuperintendent D. Günter Jacob
(Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland)

Saturday, August 16

- 9.30—9.50 MORNING WORSHIP. *Cathedral*
Dr. R. J. McCracken (American Baptist Conven-
tion)
- 10.00—13.00 FULL SESSION. *University*
Chairman's Address
Organisation of the Conference and adoption of
Constitution. Dr. L. Hodgson introduced the
Theological Commissions' Reports. Assignment
to Sections
- 16.30—18.30 FULL SESSION
Appointment of Committees:
(a) Faith and Order organisation after Lund;
Introduced by Dr. L. Hodgson
(b) Faith and Order theme for the Second
Assembly of the World Council of Churches
Introduced by Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft (General
Secretary of the World Council of Churches)

- 20.30 SERVICE OF PREPARATION FOR HOLY COMMUNION.
Cathedral
Preacher: Rev. Professor Donald M. Baillie (Church of Scotland), Chairman of the Preparatory Theological Commission on Intercommunion

Sunday, August 17

- Morning:* The authorities of the Church of Sweden announced that all members of the Conference would be welcome at the SERVICE OF HIGH MASS WITH COMMUNION in the Cathedral at 10.00 hrs. and might receive the Sacrament at that service if they so desired. The Bishop of Lund, Dr. Anders Nygren, preached
- 20.00 FULL SESSION. Introductory addresses for delegates
Speakers:
Prof. D. Dr. Edmund Schlink (Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland; Luth.): Aims of the Faith and Order Movement
Rev. Oliver S. Tomkins, Secretary of the Faith and Order Commission: 'Some implications of the Ecumenical Movement'

Monday, August 18

- 9.30—9.50 MORNING WORSHIP. *Cathedral*
Unitätsdirektor Lic. H. Renkewitz (Evangelische Brüder-Unität; Moravian Church)
- 10.00—12.00 FULL SESSION:
Addresses on 'Social and Cultural Factors in our Divisions'
Pastor Dr. H. Obendiek (Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland)
Prof. W. E. Garrison (Disciples of Christ, U.S.A.)
Prof. J. Hromádka (Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren)
Bishop John Péter (Reformed Church of Hungary)
Pasteur P. Maury (Reformed Church of France)
- 16.30—18.30 SECTION MEETINGS

- 20.00 PUBLIC MEETING: 'The World Mission of the Church'. *University*
Chairman: Rev. Dr. H. S. Leiper (Associate General Secretary, W.C.C.)
Speakers: The Rev. D. T. Niles (Methodist Church in Ceylon)
 The Rev. Dr. R. Manikam (Joint Secretary for W.C.C. and I.M.C. in S.E. Asia)
 The Rev. Farid Audeh (Evangelical Synod of Syria and Lebanon)

21.45 EVENING PRAYERS. *Cathedral*

Tuesday, August 19

- 9.30—9.50 MORNING WORSHIP. *Cathedral*
 Canon F. E. Maynard (Church of England in Australia)
- 10.00—13.00 SECTION MEETINGS
- 16.30—18.30 SECTION MEETINGS
- 20.00 CONFESSIONAL MEETINGS
- 21.45 EVENING PRAYERS. *Cathedral*

Wednesday, August 20

- 9.30—9.50 MORNING WORSHIP. *Cathedral*
 Very Rev. George Florovsky (Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople; Exarchate for Russians in the West)
- 10.00—13.00 SECTION MEETINGS
- Afternoon:* FREE. Excursion for all participants
- 21.45 EVENING PRAYERS. *Cathedral*

Thursday, August 21

- 9.30—9.50 MORNING WORSHIP. *Cathedral*
 Dr. Howard H. Brinton (Society of Friends, Philadelphia, U.S.A.)
- 10.00—11.00 FULL SESSION. Report of Business Committee, followed by
- 11.00—13.00 SECTION MEETINGS
- 14.30—16.00 " "
- 16.30—18.30 " "
- 21.45 EVENING PRAYERS. *Cathedral*

Friday, August 22

- 9.30—9.50 MORNING WORSHIP. *Cathedral*
M. le pasteur Pierre Maury (Église Réformée de France)
- 10.00—13.00 SECTION MEETINGS
- 16.30—18.30 " "
- 19.00 DINNER AND RECEPTION BY THE CITY AND PARISH OF LUND
- 21.45 EVENING PRAYERS. *Cathedral*

Saturday, August 23

- 9.30—9.50 MORNING WORSHIP. *Cathedral*
The Rev. Dr. Oscar T. Olson (Methodist Church, U.S.A.)
- 10.00—13.00 FULL SESSION. Report of Committee on Future Organisation
- Afternoon:* EXCURSION
First drafts of Reports available for study by delegates
- 21.45 EVENING PRAYERS. *Cathedral*

Sunday, August 24

- Morning:* Free for worship
- 16.00 YOUTH RALLY. *Theatre, Malmö*
Speakers:
Archbishop Y. T. Brilioth
Prof. Alexander Schmemmann (Orthodox)
Pastor Josiah Hove (Lutheran, S. Rhodesia)
Rev. Russell Chandran (Church of S. India)
Dr. C. Lund-Quist (Lutheran World Federation)
- 19.00 CONFERENCE SERVICE. Procession. *Cathedral*
Preacher: Most Rev. Y. T. Brilioth, Archbishop of Upsala

Monday, August 25

- 9.30—9.50 MORNING WORSHIP. *Cathedral*
Most Rev. Metropolitan Juhanon Mar Thoma (Mar Thoma Church, South India)

10.00—13.00	} FULL SESSIONS. Revision of Section and Committee Reports
16.30—18.30	
21.45	EVENING PRAYERS. <i>Cathedral</i>

Tuesday, August 26

9.30—9.50	MORNING WORSHIP. <i>Cathedral</i> Bischof A. Bereczky (Reformed Church of Hungary)
10.00—13.00	SECTION MEETINGS. Completion of Reports
16.30—18.30	FULL SESSION
21.45	EVENING PRAYERS. <i>Cathedral</i>

Wednesday, August 27

9.30—9.50	MORNING WORSHIP. <i>Cathedral</i> Rev. S. Duraikan (Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, India)
10.00—13.00	} FULL SESSIONS. Final approval of Reports
14.30—16.45	
17.15—19.00	
21.45	EVENING PRAYERS. <i>Cathedral</i>

Thursday, August 28

9.30—9.50	MORNING WORSHIP. <i>Cathedral</i> Rev. Dr. L. E. Cooke (Congregational Union of England and Wales)
10.00—13.00	FULL SESSION. Concluding business
14.30	Meeting of the newly-elected Faith and Order Commission
16.45—17.30	FULL SESSION. Concluding business
18.00	CLOSING SERVICE. <i>Cathedral</i>

APPENDIX 2

LIST OF DELEGATES AND ALL
OTHER PARTICIPANTS



DELEGATES APPOINTED BY THEIR CHURCHES

Delegates appointed but unable to be present are indicated by brackets. Non-autonomous Churches are followed by the name, in brackets, of the autonomous Church which also authorised the delegate.

ARGENTINA	Iglesia Metodista, Conferencia del Rio de la Plata (through Methodist Church, U.S.A.)	Rev. J. Miguez Bonino
AUSTRALASIA	Methodist Church of Australasia	Rev. H. L. Perkins
AUSTRALIA	Church of England in Australia and Tasmania	Rev. K. T. Henderson Rev. Broughton Knox Canon F. E. Maynard (Princ. E. L. Williams)
	Churches of Christ in Australia	(Princ. E. L. Williams)
	Congregational Union of Australia	Rev. George Gunson
	Presbyterian Church of Australia	Represented by Princ. J. A. Allan
AUSTRIA	Evangelische Kirche A.B. in Oesterreich	Dr. Franz Fischer
BELGIUM	Eglise Chrétienne Missionnaire Belge	Prof. E. Hoyois
	Union des Eglises Evangéliques Protestantes de Belgique	Pasteur P. Fagel
BRAZIL	Federação Sinodal	Pastor Guido Tornquist
BURMA	Burma Baptist Convention	U Ba Hmyin

CANADA	Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec	Rev. E. Davies
	Church of England in Canada	Archbishop Barfoot of Edmonton Archbishop Carrington of Quebec Prof. E. R. Fairweather Prof. R. F. Hettlinger
	Presbyterian Church in Canada	Dr. R. Lennox
	United Church of Canada	Rev. Dr. G. R. Cragg Rt. Rev. C. M. Nicholson Mr. I. C. Robison
	Methodist Church in Ceylon	Rev. R. A. Nelson Rev. D. T. Niles
CEYLON		
COLOMBIA	Presbyterian Church in Colombia	Dr. Luis Quiroga
CYPRUS	Orthodox Church of Cyprus	Represented by Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren	Prof. J. Hromádka
	Evangelical Lutheran Church in Slovakia	Bishop Chabada
	Reformed Church in Slovakia	Represented by Prof. Hromádka
DENMARK	Baptist Union of Denmark	Pres. J. Nørgaard
	Church of Denmark	(Bishop Fuglsang-Damgaard) Bishop S. Hoffmeyer Rector P. Holt (Prof. K. E. Skydsgaard) Prof. N. H. Søe
EGYPT	Coptic Orthodox Church Patriarchate of Alexandria	Rev. Marcos Daoud (Archimandrite Parthenios)
FINLAND	Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland	Bishop E. G. Gulin Rev. M. Parvio
FORMOSA	Presbyterian Church in Formosa	Rev. W. T. Hwang
FRANCE	Eglise Evangélique Luthérienne de France	(Pasteur L. Marchand)
	Eglise Réformée de France	Pasteur P. Gagnier Pasteur P. Maury Pasteur Ch. Westphal

GERMANY	Methodist Church (through Methodist Church, U.S.A.)	Rev. Dr. Paul Huber
	Moravian Church	Unitätsdirektor Lic. H. Renkewitz
	Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland	
	<i>Lutheran Churches:</i>	<i>Union Churches:</i>
	Dr. H. H. Harms	Dr. J. Beckmann
	Dr. G. Hoffmann	Dr. G. Jacob
	Dr. F. Hübner	Prof. J. Iwand
	Prof. Dr. E. Kinder	Dr. M. Niemöller
	Bishop H. Lilje	Prof. E. Schlink
	Dozent H. Meyer	Dr. J. Winterhager
Dr. W. Schanze	<i>Reformed Churches:</i>	
Dr. T. Schlatter	Dr. W. Herrenbrück	
Prof. E. Sommerlath	Prof. W. Kreck	
Bishop W. Stählin	Dr. W. Niesel	
	Dr. H. Obendiek	
GREECE	Church of Greece	(Metropolitan Agathonikos of Kalavrita) (Prof. H. S. Alivisatos) (Metropolitan Ambrosios of Phthiotis) (Prof. B. Ioannidis) (Prof. J. Karmiris) (Metropolitan Panteleimon of Salonica)
	Evangelical Church of Greece	Dr. G. A. Hadjiantoniou
HUNGARY	Lutheran Church of Hungary	Bishop L. Dezséry Bishop L. Vetö
	Reformed Church of Hungary	Bishop A. Bereczky Mr. Roland Kiss Bishop J. Péter
ICELAND	Evangelical Lutheran Church	Bishop S. Sigurdsson
INDIA	Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon	Bishop G. N. L. Hall Rev. E. John Bishop Lakdasa De Mel
	Church of South India	Rev. J. R. Chandran Bishop C. K. Jacob Rev. A. Marcus Ward
	Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches in India	Rev. S. Duraikan (Rev. A. N. Gopal)
	Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar	Metropolitan Juhanon
	Orthodox Syrian Church of Malabar	Fr. K. Philipos

INDIA	United Church of North India ditto (West Pakistan)	Very Rev. A. Ralla Ram Rev. W. Stewart Rev. A. Thakur Das
INDONESIA	Chinese Church in West Java	Dr. Boen-Giok Pouw
ITALY	Chiesa Evangelica Valdese	Prof. V. Subilia
JAPAN	Nippon Kirisuto Kyodan (Church of Christ) Nippon Sei Ko Kwai (Anglican Church in Japan)	Rev. T. Muto Dr. Floyd Shacklock (Rev. J. Lloyd) Rev. Paul K. Yashiro
KOREA	Presbyterian Church of Korea	Rev. Sang Kwon Kim
MADAGASCAR	Congregational Churches	Rev. George E. Burton
MALAYA	Methodist Church in South-East Asia (through Methodist Church, U.S.A.)	Princ. H. B. Amstutz
NETHERLANDS	Evangelisch Lutherske Kerk Nederlands Hervormde Kerk Old Catholic Church Remonstrantse Broederschap	Prof. P. Boendermaker Prof. Berkelbach v. d. Sprenkel Dr. H. Berkhof Dr. E. Emmen Dr. H. van der Linde Dr. J. M. van Veen Archbishop A. Rinkel Prof. G. J. Sirks
NEW ZEALAND	Associated Churches of Christ in New Zealand Baptist Union of New Zealand Congregational Union of New Zealand Presbyterian Church of New Zealand	Represented by Dr. S. J. England Rev. H. Ingli James Represented by Principal J. A. Allan Principal J. A. Allan
NORTHERN RHODESIA	Church of Central Africa in Rhodesia	Rev. K. D. Francis
NORWAY	Church of Norway	Bishop Bjarne Skard Rev. K. Støylen
SOUTH AFRICA	Church of the Province of South Africa Disciples of Christ in Southern Africa (through International Convention of Disciples of Christ, U.S.A.) Nederduitse Herv. of Geref. Kerk van S.A.	Fr. H. E. Symonds, C.R. Rev. Basil Holt Pastor Dr. J. Lombard

SOUTHERN RHODESIA	Lutheran Church of S. Rhodesia (through Church of Sweden)	Rev. Josiah Hove
	Methodist Church of S. Rhodesia (through Methodist Church of Gt. Britain)	Rev. G. E. H. Pluke
SWEDEN	Church of Sweden	Dean Dr. R. Askmark Bishop Aulén Archbishop Brilioth Rev. Prof. R. Bring Rev. P. Edwall Bishop A. Nygren Rev. A. Werner
	Mission Covenant Church of Sweden	Rector K.-G. Isakson
	Methodist Church of Sweden (through American Methodist Board of Missions)	Rev. G. Henriksson
SWITZERLAND	Old Catholic Church Swiss Protestant Church Federation	Prof. Dr. Urs Küry Prof. H. d'Espine Prof. D. Ernst Staehelin
SYRIA	Evangelical Synod of Syria and Lebanon	Rev. Farid Audeh
	Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch	Represented by Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira
THAILAND	Church of Christ in Thailand	Rev. Sook Pongsnoi
UNITED KINGDOM AND IRELAND	Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland	Rev. Princ. K. C. Dykes Mr. C. T. LeQuesne, Q.C. Rev. Dr. E. A. Payne (Dr. William Robinson) Bishop of Chelmsford Bishop of Derby Bishop of Dorchester Canon S. L. Greenslade Rev. Mother Margaret (Prioress, St. Hilda's Priory)
	Churches of Christ Church of England	Prof. A. M. Ramsey Canon H. E. W. Turner Rev. R. Adams Rev. Prof. R. R. Hartford Ven. H. W. Rennison Rev. Prof. D. M. Baillie Rev. Dr. A. C. Craig, M.C. Rev. Dr. N. Davidson
	Church of Ireland	
	Church of Scotland	

UNITED KINGDOM AND IRELAND	Church in Wales	Sheriff J. R. Philip, Q.C. Rev. J. K. S. Reid (Rev. Chancellor H. K. Archdall) (Very Rev. W. G. H. Simon)
	Congregational Union of England and Wales	Rev. Principal H. Lovell Cocks
	Episcopal Church in Scotland	Dr. L. E. Cooke Bishop of Brechin
	Methodist Church	Prof. D. M. Mackinnon
		Rev. B. Clutterbuck
		Rev. Dr. R. E. Davies
		Rev. Dr. R. Newton Flew
	Methodist Church in Ireland	Rev. I. Morgan
		Rev. Dr. H. Watkin-Jones (Rev. R. Lee Cole)
	Presbyterian Church of England	Dr. W. Northridge
	Presbyterian Church of Ireland	Rev. Dr. D. J. Martin
	Presbyterian Church of Wales	Mr. J. M. Ross
		Rev. J. S. P. Black Rev. J. R. Boyd
	Society of Friends in Great Britain	Rev. H. W. Griffith (Princ. W. R. Williams)
Society of Friends in Ireland	Mr. Percy W. Bartlett	
U.S.A.	African Methodist Episcopal Church	Mrs. Sylvia Green
	African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church	Bishop A. J. Allen Bishop D. Ward Nichols
	American Baptist Convention	Bishop D. C. Pope
		Pres. H. Gezork
		Rev. R. J. McCracken
		Dr. R. E. Nelson
	American Lutheran Church	Dr. E. Pruden
		Dr. J. Skoglund
	Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church	Dr. J. Bodensieck Dr. L. Ludwig
	Church of the Brethren	Rev. Dr. C. Bergendoff Rev. Dr. E. H. Wahlstrom
	Colored Methodist Episcopal Church	Dr. Calvert N. Ellis
	Congregational Christian Churches	Dr. J. A. Johnson, Jr.
		Dr. R. L. Calhoun
		Dr. Douglas Horton Dr. P. S. Minear

U.S.A.

	Dr. H. V. White
	Dr. D. D. Williams
Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church	Rev. Dr. J. Knudsen
Evangelical and Reformed Church	Dr. David Dunn Dr. Allen O. Miller
Evangelical United Brethren Church	Dr. P. H. Eller Pres. W. N. Roberts
International Convention of Disciples of Christ	Dr. S. J. England Dr. P. E. Gresham Dr. D. R. Lindley Dr. R. E. Osborn Dr. H. E. Short
Methodist Church	(Dean C. T. Craig) Dr. R. Cushman Dr. G. Harkness Bishop Ivan Lee Holt Dean W. G. Muelder Dr. O. T. Olson Dr. A. C. Outler Prof. W. A. Smart
Polish National Catholic Church, U.S.A.	(Bishop John Misiaszek)
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.	Dr. J. Newton Thomas
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.	Rev. Dr. E. C. Blake Prof. P. Lehmann Rev. Dr. A. L. Miller Rev. Dr. H. E. Nicely Prof. L. J. Trinterud
Protestant Episcopal Church	Bishop S. Bayne Prof. P. M. Dawley Bishop Angus Dun Mr. Clifford P. Morehouse Canon T. O. Wedel
Reformed Church in America	Dr. B. J. Mulder Prof. J. Vander Kolk
Religious Society of Friends:	
Five Years Meeting	Rev. A. Ward Applegate
General Conference	Preston T. Roberts, Jr.
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting	Dr. H. H. Brinton
Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America	Bishop John of San Francisco
United Lutheran Church in America	Rev. Dr. T. A. Kantonen Rev. Dr. Carl C. Rasmussen

U.S.A.		Rev. Dr. Luther D. Reed Rev. Dr. John Schmidt Rev. Dr. J. Sittler, Jr. Rev. Dr. T. M. Taylor
	United Presbyterian Church of North America	
WEST AFRICA	Church of the Province of West Africa	Rev. Harry Sawyerr
WEST INDIES	Anglican Church of the West Indies	Bishop of Barbados
YUGOSLAVIA	Orthodox Patriarchate of Serbia	(Bishop German) (Prof. D. Glumaç)
NON- NATIONAL CHURCHES	Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople	Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira Prof. C. Konstantinidis Prof. E. Photiades Prof. M. Repanellis Archmandrite E. Timiadis Archpriest S. Timtchenko
	ditto (Exarchate for Rus- sians in the West)	Prof. G. Florovsky Prof. L. Zander
	Church of the East and of the Assyrians	His Holiness Mar Shimun
	Salvation Army	Lt.-Col. G. Bolander Colonel R. Nilson
	Union of the Armenian Evangelical Churches in the Near East	Rev. H. P. Aharonian

CONSULTANTS

Fr. H. R. T. Brandreth, O.G.S., Church of England
 Prof. H. Clavier, Reformed Church of France
 Prof. J. Courvoisier, Swiss Protestant Church Federation
 Dr. P. D. Devanandan, Church of South India
 Dr. W. E. Garrison, Disciples of Christ, U.S.A.
 Mr. Eric Hayman, Church of England
 Fr. A. G. Hebert, S.S.M., Church of England
 Prof. Walter M. Horton, Congregational Christian Churches in the U.S.A.
 Dean Nils Karlström, Church of Sweden
 Pfarrer Helmut Kühne, Evangelical Church in Germany
 Prebendary A. J. Macdonald, D.D., Church of England
 Rev. Dr. W. D. Maxwell, Church of Scotland
 Pfarrer Lic. W. Menn, Evangelical Church in Germany
 Dr. David G. Moses, United Church of Northern India
 Dr. G. W. Richards, Evangelical and Reformed Church, U.S.A.

Prof. Dr. Albert E. Ruthy, Old Catholic Church of Switzerland
 Prof. John C. Schroeder, Congregational Christian Churches in the U.S.A.
 Dr. W. Stökl, Evangelical Church of the Augsburgian and Helvetic Confession
 in Austria
 Rev. Dr. T. F. Torrance, M.B.E., Church of Scotland
 Pastor W. Vos, Reformed Church of the Netherlands
 Dr. Olive Wyon, Church of Scotland
 Dr. Nicolas Zernov, Russian Orthodox Church (England)

Special Consultants (from churches unable to appoint official delegates)

Most Rev. J. Köpp, Archbishop of Estonia, Evangelical Lutheran Church of Estonia
 Most Rev. Tiran Nersoyan, Archbishop of the Armenian Church in America
 Bishop Terenig Poladian, Armenian Catholicate of Cilicia
 Archimandrite Chahe Adjamian, Armenian Church, Lebanon
 Rev. Elmars V. Rozitis, Evangelical Lutheran Church of Latvia

Fraternal Visitors

*Princ. J. A. Allan, National Council of Churches in New Zealand
 Dr. E. C. Bhatta, National Christian Council of India
 Prof. William R. Cannon, World Methodist Council
 Dr. S. M. Cavert, National Council of Churches of Christ, U.S.A.
 Rev. Dr. J. W. Decker, International Missionary Council
 Dr. E. Fogelklou Norlind, Friends World Committee for Consultation
 Rev. Prof. J. L. M. Haire, British Council of Churches
 *Rev. Basil F. Holt, Christian Council of South Africa
 *Bishop C. K. Jacob, United Bible Societies
 Dr. Paul M. Limbert, World's Y.M.C.A.
 Dr. Carl E. Lund-Quist, Lutheran World Federation
 *Rev. Dr. R. J. McCracken, World Council for Christian Education
 Rev. Dr. Arnold T. Ohrn, Baptist World Alliance
 Rev. Dr. Marcel Pradervand, World Presbyterian Alliance
 (*Dr. William Robinson, World Convention of Churches of Christ)
 *Dr. N. Zernov, Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius

* Also a delegate or consultant

Staff Consultants

Rev. R. S. Bilheimer	Dr. J. R. Nelson
Dr. Nils Ehrenström	Mr. Frank Northam
Dr. Leonard Hodgson	Dr. Floyd W. Tomkins
Dr. H. Kraemer	Rev. Oliver S. Tomkins
Dr. H. S. Leiper	Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft
Dr. R. B. Manikam	Dr. H. H. Walz
Rev. B.-T. Molander	

YOUTH GROUP

- Rev. Prof. Alexandre Schmemmann, Russian Orthodox Church of N. America
—leader of group
- Mr. G. Boeddinghaus, Evangelical Church in Germany
- Mr. Torgny Bohlin, Church of Sweden
- Rev. Ralph Bucy, Presbyterian Church in the United States
- Mr. Thomas Clagett, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
- Rev. Roger Fredrikson, American Baptist Convention
- Pfarrer Hans Frei, Old Catholic Church of Switzerland
- Rev. Niels H. Gadegaard, Church of Denmark
- Miss Norah Henshall, Church of England
- Rev. Reid Isaac, Methodist Church, U.S.A.
- Mr. William Lazareth, United Lutheran Church in America
- Mr. Joseph Mangalam, United Church of North India
- Rev. Peter Martinson, Church of the Province of West Africa
- Miss Sophia L. Mourouka, Church of Greece
- Mr. William R. Schisler, Methodist Church, Brazil
- Mr. Nikita Struve, Oecumenical Patriarchate (Russians in the West)
- Frère Max Thurian, Reformed Church of France
- Mr. Morris West, Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland
- Rev. David Wilson, Methodist Church in Ceylon

ACCREDITED VISITORS

- Pastor B. Aastrand
 Pastor B. Almgren
 Dr. G. Ankar
 Monsignor B. Assarsson
 Dr. Bachman
 Dean George B. Barbour
 Mrs. George B. Barbour
 Rev. Hugh S. Barbour, Ph.D.
 Mrs. Barfoot
 Dr. Edwin A. Bell
 Miss J. Blauenfeld
 Dean Nils Bolander
 Dr. G. W. Buckner, Jr.
 Lic. Dr. Martin Burgwitz
 Mrs. Philip Carrington
 Mrs. S. M. Cavert
 Prof. Robert R. Clemmer
 Dr. Leroy G. Cleverdon
 Rev. Canon N. J. Cockburn
 Rev. T. H. Croxall
 Pastor G. Dahmén
 Pastor H. Danielson
 Dean A. T. DeGroot
 Rev. Father R. M. Doyle
 Prof. Lic. Walter Dress
 Dr. P. W. Drobnitzky
 Pfarrer Dr. Dummer
 Dr. Ansgar Eeg-Olofsson
 Pastor S. Engberg
 Mrs. Newton Flew
 Rev. James E. Fogartie
 Rev. Ernest L. Fogg
 Miss M. B. Foster
 Rev. Torsten B. Franzén
 Pfarrer Funke
 Pfarrer R. Geisendorfer
 Pfarrer Dr. F. S. Geller
 Pater J. Gerlach, S.J.
 Pfarrer Dr. Theol. Günther Gloede
 Rev. Martin H. Harper
 Pfarrer Lic. H. C. von Hase
 Rev. Blahoslav Hruby
 Miss Thelma G. James
 Direktor H. Johansson
 Rev. C. H. Jones
 Rev. Th. Källstad
 Dr. James W. Kennedy
 Chaplain (Capt.) Leon W. Kidd
 Pfarrer Erich Kröning
 Mr. J. G. LeQuesne
 Dr. theol. Alf Lier
 Pastor G. Lignell
 Miss Signe Lindquist
 Very Rev. T. H. C. McFall
 Dr. Paul G. Macy
 Prof. James L. Martin
 Miss Elsa M. May
 Dr. Meinhof
 Dr. Carl Michalson
 Dr. James Hastings Nichols
 Père M. de Paillerets
 Mr. A. Papadopoulos
 Rev. P. J. Fiig-Pedersen
 Mrs. A. E. J. Rawlinson
 Rev. W. D. Robinson
 Prof. U. Saarnivaara
 Rev. G. D. Savage
 Mrs. H. A. E. Sawyerr
 Dr. H. Schlyter
 Pfarrer Dr. Schneider
 Rev. Theodore E. Schulz
 Pfarrer H. Schulze
 Mrs. F. Shacklock
 Miss Winifred Shorney
 Miss Barbara Simonds
 Miss P. Spencer
 Frau G. Staehelin
 Mrs. Edwin Allen Stebbins
 Ven. Archdeacon T. D. Sully
 Fil. Mag. N. Sundholm
 Miss A. B. Taylor
 Mr. Howard H. Thorne
 Propst Karl Timm
 Pfarrer H. Truckenbrodt
 Rev. R. H. Warmoll
 Mrs. H. Watkin-Jones
 Mrs. T. O. Wedel
 Dr. A. P. Wikgren
 Rev. Dr. Richard H. Wilmer, Jr.
 Mrs. Andrew D. Wolfe
 Mr. Carlyle Yates
 Rev. A. Zodiates

CONFERENCE STAFF

Conference Office Secretaries

Miss Sigrid Morden
Miss Margaret Rhodes

Press Secretaries

Mr. T. B. Causton
Mrs. Elsie Thomas Culver

Secretarial Staff

Miss Anna Ankar
Miss Margery Bailey
Miss Kathleen Claxton
Miss Morfydd Evans

Miss Winsome Fulford
Miss Aat Guitart
Fru Vreneli Hallmark
Mlle. Fanchette Mayor
Madame Muller
Miss Ann Mumford
Miss Joan Pring
Mrs. J. O. Rushton
Fräulein L. Schiller
Miss Margareta Stjernström
Miss Lois Taylor
Miss Cynthia Wilson

INTERPRETERS

Lady W. Dent
Miss Ilse Friedeberg
Mr. M. A. Halliwell
Monsieur Robert Hasler
Fräulein Renate Kral
Miss Mireio Leuthold

Miss Olga Pocock
Herr Christoph Rhein
Miss Tomoko Sakai
Mr. Eberhard G. Wedell
Mrs. Rosemarie Wedell

USHERS

Rev. Anders Andréén
Mrs. Anders Andréén
Mr. Donald Allchin
Mrs. M. Brown
Rev. C. H. S. Cheesman
Rev. George Cobbett

Herr Helge Heisler
Mrs. Kent Knutson
Mr. Lewis S. Mudge
Mr. Bruce Rosier
Mr. Magne Saeboe
Rev. Sumner Walters, Jr.

LOCAL ARRANGEMENTS COMMITTEE

Dr. theol. Herman Schlyter, *Chairman*
Miss Margareta Stjernström, *Secretary*
Pastor B. Aastrand
Pastor Bruno Almgren

Pastor Gunnar Dahmén
Pastor Harry Danielson
Pastor Sigurd Engberg

APPENDIX 3

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONFERENCE
INTO SECTIONS



I. CHURCH

Chairman:

Dr. P. M. Dawley Protestant Episcopal Church U.S.A.

Secretaries:

Dr. G. R. Cragg United Church of Canada Canada
Fr. K. Philipos Orthodox Syrian Church of South India
Malabar

Delegates:

Principal J. A. Allan Presbyterian Church of N.Z. New Zealand
Bishop A. J. Allen African Methodist Episcopal Church U.S.A.
Rev. H. B. Amstutz Methodist Church in S.E. Asia Malaya
Archbishop Athenagoras Oecumenical Patriarchate of (England)
of Thyateira Constantinople
Mr. P. W. Bartlett Society of Friends England
Dr. C. Bergendoff Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church U.S.A.
Prof. S. F. H. J. Berkelbach Reformed Church of the Netherlands Holland
v. d. Sprenkel
Rev. J. M. Bonino Methodist Church of Brazil Argentina
Rev. E. Davies Baptist Convention of Ontario Canada
and Quebec
Bishop A. Dun Protestant Episcopal Church U.S.A.
Prof. D. Dunn Evangelical and Reformed Church U.S.A.
Dr. P. H. Eller Evangelical United Brethren Church U.S.A.
Dr. S. J. England Disciples of Christ U.S.A.
Prof. E. R. Fairweather Church of England in Canada Canada
Dr. R. Newton Flew Methodist Church England
Dr. G. A. Hadjiantoniou Greek Evangelical Church Greece
Bishop G. N. L. Hall Church of India, Pakistan, India
Burma and Ceylon

Dr. H. H. Harms	Evangelical Church in Germany (V.E.L.K.D.)	Germany
Rev. G. Henriksson	Methodist Church of Sweden	Sweden
U Ba Hmyin	Burma Baptist Convention	Burma
Bishop S. Hoffmeyer	Church of Denmark	Denmark
Bishop I. L. Holt	Methodist Church	U.S.A.
Rev. J. Hove	Lutheran Church of S. Rhodesia	S. Rhodesia
Rev. W. T. Hwang	Presbyterian Church	Formosa
Dr. E. Kinder	Evangelical Church(V.E.L.K.D.)	Germany
Prof. C. Konstantinidis	Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople	Turkey
Prof. U. Küry	Old Catholic Church	Switzerland
Mr. C. T. LeQuesne	Baptist Union of G.B. and Ireland	England
Dr. J. Lombard	Ned. Herv. of Geref. Kerk, S.A.	S. Africa
Mother Margaret, O.H.P.	Church of England	England
Dr. P. S. Minear	Congregational Christian Churches	U.S.A.
Colonel R. Nilson	Salvation Army	Sweden
Dr. W. L. Northridge	Methodist Church	Ireland
Bishop A. Nygren	Church of Sweden	Sweden
Dr. R. E. Osborn	Disciples of Christ	U.S.A.
Prof. E. Photiadès	Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople	Turkey
Bishop D. C. Pope	African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church	U.S.A.
Rev. C. C. Rasmussen	United Lutheran Church in America	U.S.A.
Rt. Rev. K. Riches (Bishop of Dorchester)	Church of England	England
Archbishop A. Rinkel	Old Catholic Church	Holland
Prof. E. Schlink	Evangelical Church (Lutheran)	Germany
Prof. G. J. Sirks	Remonstrantse Broederschap	Holland
Prof. E. Staehelin	Swiss Protestant Church Federa- tion	Switzerland
Rev. W. Stewart	United Church of N. India	India
Prof. T. M. Taylor	United Presbyterian Church of N. America	U.S.A.
Rev. G. Tornquist	Federação Sinodal (Lutheran)	Brazil
<i>Consultants:</i>		
Dr. P. D. Devanandan	Church of South India	India
Rev. Preb. A. J. Macdonald	Church of England	England
Prof. T. F. Torrance	Church of Scotland	Scotland
<i>Youth Group:</i>		
Rev. H. Frei	Old Catholic Church	Switzerland
Miss N. Henshall	Church of England	England

Rev. P. Martinson	Church of the Province of W. Africa	Gold Coast
Miss S. Mourouka	Church of Greece	(England)

Fraternal Visitors:

Prof. W. R. Cannon	World Methodist Council	U.S.A.
Dr. J. W. Decker	International Missionary Council	U.S.A.
Dr. C. E. Lund-Quist	Lutheran World Federation	Switzerland

II. CHURCH

Chairman:

Prof. H. d'Espine	Swiss Protestant Church Federation	Switzerland
-------------------	------------------------------------	-------------

Secretaries:

Prof. H. E. W. Turner	Church of England	England
Dr. J. Winterhager	Evangelical Church in Germany	Germany

Delegates:

Rev. J. S. P. Black	Presbyterian Church in Ireland	N. Ireland
Dr. E. C. Blake	Presbyterian Church in U.S.A.	U.S.A.
Prof. P. Boendermaker	Evangelisch Lutherse Kerk	Holland
Prof. R. Bring	Church of Sweden	Sweden
Rev. A. T. Das	United Church of North India	Pakistan
Dr. C. N. Ellis	Church of the Brethren	U.S.A.
Prof. F. Fischer	Evangelical Lutheran Church	Austria
Rev. K. D. Francis	Church of Central Africa	Rhodesia
Rt. Rev. E. Graham (Bishop of Brechin)	Episcopal Church in Scotland	Scotland
Rev. H. W. Griffith	Presbyterian Church of Wales	Wales
Bishop E. G. Gulin	Church of Finland	Finland
Dr. G. Harkness	Methodist Church	U.S.A.
Dr. G. Hoffman	Evangelical Church in Germany (Luth.)	Germany
Prof. J. Hromádka	Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren	Czechoslovakia
Dr. G. Jacob	Evangelical Church in Germany	Germany
Rev. H. I. James	Baptist Union of N. Zealand	England
Bishop John	Russian Orthodox Church of N. America	U.S.A.
Rev. S. K. Kim	Presbyterian Church in Korea	Korea
Rev. B. Knox	Church of England in Australia and Tasmania	Australia
Dr. J. Knudsen	Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America	U.S.A.
Prof. J. Vander Kolk	Reformed Church in America	U.S.A.

Prof. W. Kreck	Evangelical Church in Germany	Germany
Dr. R. Lennox	Presbyterian Church in Canada	Canada
Dr. D. J. Martin	Presbyterian Church of England	England
Pastor P. Maury	Reformed Church of France	France
Dr. R. J. McCracken	American Baptist Convention	U.S.A.
Dr. H. Meyer	Evangelical Church in Germany (Luth.)	Germany
Dr. I. Morgan	Methodist Church	England
Dean W. G. Muelder	Methodist Church	U.S.A.
Rev. T. Muto	Church of Christ in Japan	Japan
Dr. A. C. Outler	Methodist Church	U.S.A.
Rev. H. L. Perkins	Methodist Church of Australasia	Australia
Rev. G. E. H. Pluke	Methodist Church in S. Rhodesia	S. Rhodesia
Dr. L. Quiroga	Presbyterian Church in Colombia	Colombia
Dr. P. T. Roberts Jr.	Friends General Conference	U.S.A.
Rev. H. Sawyerr	Anglican Province of W. Africa	Sierra Leone
Dr. T. Schlatter	Evangelical Church in Germany (Luth.)	Germany
Prof. V. Subilia	Waldensian Church	Italy
Rev. H. E. Symonds, C.R.	Church of Province of S. Africa	S. Africa
Rev. A. Werner	Church of Sweden	Sweden

Special Consultant:

Archimandrite C. Adjamian	Armenian Patriarchate of Cilicia	Lebanon
---------------------------	----------------------------------	---------

Consultants:

Prof. H. Clavier	Reformed Church of France	France
Prof. J. Courvoisier	Swiss Protestant Church Federation	Switzerland
Prof. W. M. Horton	Congregational Christian Churches	U.S.A.

Youth Group:

Mr. G. Boeddinghaus	Evangelical Church in Germany	Germany
Rev. R. Bucy	Presbyterian Church in the U.S.	U.S.A.
Mr. T. Clagett	Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.	U.S.A.
Fr. A. Schmemmann	Russian Orthodox Church of N. America	(U.S.A.)

Fraternal Visitors:

Dr. E. C. Bhatta	National Christian Council of India	India
Prof. J. L. M. Haire	British Council of Churches	N. Ireland
Dr. A. T. Ohrn	Baptist World Alliance	U.S.A.

III. CHURCH

Chairman:

Dr. D. Horton	Congregational Christian Churches	U.S.A.
---------------	-----------------------------------	--------

Secretaries:

Dr. H. van der Linde	Reformed Church of the Netherlands	Holland
Dr. J. R. Nelson	Methodist Church	U.S.A.

Delegates:

Rev. H. P. Aharonian	Union of Armenian Evangelical Churches in the Near East	Lebanon
Bishop G. Aulén	Church of Sweden	Sweden
Bishop A. Bereczky	Reformed Church of Hungary	Hungary
Col. G. Bolander	Salvation Army	Sweden
Rev. J. R. Boyd	Presbyterian Church in Ireland	Ireland
Prof. R. L. Calhoun	Congregational Christian Churches	U.S.A.
Dr. H. F. L. Cocks	Congregational Union of England and Wales	England
Dr. A. C. Craig, M.C.	Church of Scotland	Scotland
Rev. M. Daoud	Coptic Orthodox Church	Egypt
Dr. E. Emmen	Reformed Church of Netherlands	Holland
Prof. G. Florovsky	Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople (Exarchate for Russians in the West)	U.S.A.
Prof. R. R. Hartford	Church of Ireland	Ireland
Rev. K. T. Henderson	Church of England in Australia and Tasmania	Australia
Rector P. Holt	Church of Denmark	Denmark
Rev. Dr. P. Huber	Methodist Church	Germany
Prof. H. J. Iwand	Evangelical Church in Germany	Germany
Dr. J. A. Johnson, Jr.	Colored Methodist Episcopal Church	U.S.A.
Prof. T. A. Kantonen	United Lutheran Church in America	U.S.A.
Mr. R. Kiss	Reformed Church in Hungary	Hungary
Prof. P. Lehmann	Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.	U.S.A.
Dr. D. R. Lindley	Disciples of Christ	U.S.A.
Dr. L. Ludwig	American Lutheran Church	U.S.A.
Prof. A. O. Miller	Evangelical and Reformed Church	U.S.A.
Rev. R. A. Nelson	Methodist Church in Ceylon	Ceylon

Bishop D. Nichols	African Methodist Episcopal Church	U.S.A.
Pres. J. Nörgaard	Baptist Union of Denmark	Denmark
Prof. H. Obendiek	Evangelical Church in Germany	Germany
Bishop J. Péter	Reformed Church of Hungary	Hungary
Sheriff J. R. Philip, Q.C.	Church of Scotland	Scotland
Dr. B.-G. Pouw	Chinese Church in West Java	Indonesia
Prof. A. M. Ramsey	Church of England	England
Pres. W. N. Roberts	Evangelical United Brethren Church	U.S.A.
Mr. I. C. Robison	United Church of Canada	Canada
Mr. J. M. Ross	Presbyterian Church	England
Dr. H. E. Short	Disciples of Christ	U.S.A.
Dr. J. E. Skoglund	American Baptist Convention	U.S.A.
Prof. W. A. Smart	Methodist Church	U.S.A.
Prof. N. H. Søre	Church of Denmark	Denmark
Dr. J. N. Thomas	Presbyterian Church in the U.S.	U.S.A.
Prof. E. H. Wahlstrom	Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church	U.S.A.
Dr. H. Watkin-Jones	Methodist Church	England
Canon T. O. Wedel	Protestant Episcopal Church	U.S.A.
Pastor Ch. Westphal	Reformed Church of France	France
Rev. P. Yashiro	Anglican Church in Japan	Japan
<i>Special Consultants:</i>		
Archbishop Tiran (Nersoyan)	Armenian Church of N. America	U.S.A.
Bishop T. Poladian	Armenian Catholicate of Cilicia	Lebanon
<i>Consultants:</i>		
Dr. W. E. Garrison	Disciples of Christ	U.S.A.
Dr. D. G. Moses	United Church of North India	India
Dr. G. W. Richards	Evangelical and Reformed Church	U.S.A.
<i>Youth Group:</i>		
Mr. T. Bohlin	Church of Sweden	Sweden
Rev. R. Isaac	Methodist Church	U.S.A.
Mr. J. Mangalam	United Church of North India	India
Mr. N. Struve	Oecumenical Patriarchate (Russians in the West)	France
<i>Fraternal Visitors:</i>		
Dr. S. M. Cavert	National Council of Churches of Christ	U.S.A.
Dr. P. M. Limbert	World's Y.M.C.A.	U.S.A.
Dr. M. Pradervand	Presbyterian World Alliance	Switzerland

IV. WAYS OF WORSHIP

Chairman:

Bishop H. Lilje	Evangelical Church in Germany (Luth.)	Germany
-----------------	--	---------

Secretaries:

Rev. Marcus Ward	Church of South India	India
Rev. Russell Chandran	Church of South India	India

(Note: Mr. Ward took over the chairmanship during the last few days of the conference after Bishop Lilje's departure.)

Delegates:

Rev. A. W. Applegate	Five Years Meeting of Friends	U.S.A.
Rev. Farid Audeh	Evangelical Synod of Syria and Lebanon	Lebanon
Rt. Rev. W. F. Barfoot, Archbishop of Edmonton	Church of England in Canada	Canada
Dr. J. Beckmann	Evangelical Church of Germany	Germany
Dr. H. Berkhof	Netherlands Reformed Church	Holland
Dr. J. Bodensieck	American Lutheran Church	U.S.A.
Most Rev. Y. T. Brilioth, Archbishop of Uppsala	Church of Sweden	Sweden
Dr. H. H. Brinton	Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends	U.S.A.
Rev. G. E. Burton	Congregational Church in Madagascar	Madagascar
Most Rev. P. Carrington, Archbishop of Quebec	Church of England in Canada	Canada
Dr. L. E. Cooke	Congregational Union of Eng- land and Wales	England
Rev. Dr. N. Davidson	Church of Scotland	Scotland
Rt. Rev. L. De Mel, Bishop of Kurunagala	Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon	Ceylon
Principal K. C. Dykes	Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland	England
Rev. P. Edwall	Church of Sweden	Sweden
Pasteur P. Fagel	Union des Eglises Evangéliques Protestantes de Belgique	Belgium
Pasteur P. Gagnier	Reformed Church of France	France
Mrs. Sylvia Green	Society of Friends in Ireland	Ireland
Dr. W. Herrenbrück	Evangelical Church in Germany	Germany
Rev. K.-G. Isakson	Mission Covenant Church of Sweden	Sweden
Prof. D. M. Mackinnon	Episcopal Church of Scotland	Scotland
Rt. Rev. G. L. G. Mandeville, Bishop of Barbados	Anglican Church of the West Indies	Barbados

Dr. A. L. Miller	Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.	U.S.A.
Dr. B. J. Mulder	Reformed Church in America	U.S.A.
Rev. M. Parvio	Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland	Finland
Rev. Sook Pongsnoi	Church of Christ in Thailand	Thailand
Dr. E. Pruden	American Baptist Convention	U.S.A.
Dr. L. D. Reed	United Lutheran Church in America	U.S.A.
Prof. M. Repanellis	Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople	Turkey
Dr. W. Schanze	Evangelical Church in Germany (Luth.)	Germany
Dr. F. Shacklock	Nippon Kirisuto Kyodan (Church of Christ)	Japan
Bishop S. Sigurdsson	Evangelical Lutheran Church of Iceland	Iceland
Dr. J. Sittler	United Lutheran Church	U.S.A.
Bishop B. Skard	Church of Norway	Norway
Bishop W. Stählin	Evangelical Church in Germany (Luth.)	Germany
Rev. K. Støylen	Church of Norway	Norway
Archimandrite E. Timiadis	Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople	(Belgium)
Prof. L. J. Trinterud	Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.	U.S.A.
Prof. L. Zander	Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople	(France)
<i>Special Consultant:</i>		
Most Rev. J. Köpp, Archbishop of Estonia	Evangelical Lutheran Church of Estonia	(Sweden)
<i>Consultants:</i>		
Mr. E. Hayman	Church of England	England
Pastor H. Kühne	Evangelical Church in Germany	Germany
Dr. W. D. Maxwell	Church of Scotland	Scotland
Pfarrer Lic. W. Menn	Evangelical Church in Germany	Germany
Prof. A. E. Rothy	Old Catholic Church of Switzerland	Switzerland
Prof. J. C. Schroeder	Congregational Christian Churches	U.S.A.
Dr. W. Stökl	Evangelical Church of the Augsburgian and Helvetic Confession in Austria	Austria
Pastor W. Vos	Reformed Church of the Netherlands	Holland
Dr. Olive Wyon	Church of Scotland	Scotland

Youth Group:

Rev. R. Fredrikson	American Baptist Convention	U.S.A.
Rev. N. H. Gadegaard	Church of Denmark	Denmark
Mr. W. R. Schisler	Methodist Church of Brazil	Brazil
Frère M. Thurian	Reformed Church of France	France

Fraternal Visitor:

Dr. E. Fogelklou Norlind	Society of Friends	Sweden
--------------------------	--------------------	--------

V. INTERCOMMUNION

Dr. E. A. Payne	Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland	England
-----------------	--	---------

Secretaries:

Prof. R. Hettlinger	Church of England in Canada	Canada
Prof. J. K. S. Reid	Church of Scotland	Scotland

Delegates:

Rev. R. Adams	Church of Ireland	Ireland
Rt. Rev. S. F. Allison, Bishop of Chelmsford	Church of England	England
Dean R. Askmark	Church of Sweden	Sweden
Prof. D. M. Baillie	Church of Scotland	Scotland
Rt. Rev. S. F. Bayne, Jr., Bishop of Olympia	Protestant Episcopal Church	U.S.A.
Bishop V. Chabada	Evangelical Lutheran Church in Slovakia	Czechoslovakia
Rev. B. Clutterbuck	Methodist Church	England
Prof. R. E. Cushman	Methodist Church	U.S.A.
Rev. R. E. Davies	Methodist Church	England
Bishop L. Dezséry	Lutheran Church of Hungary	Hungary
Rev. S. Duraikan	Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches in India	India
Pres. H. Gezork	American Baptist Convention	U.S.A.
Canon S. L. Greenslade	Church of England	England
Dr. P. E. Gresham	Disciples of Christ	U.S.A.
Rev. G. Gunson	Congregational Union of Australia	Australia
Rev. B. Holt	Disciples of Christ in S. Africa	(S. Africa)
Prof. E. Hoyois	Eglise Chrétienne Missionaire Belge	Belgium
Dr. F. Hübner	Evangelical Church in Germany (Luth.)	Germany
Bishop C. K. Jacob	Church of South India	India
Metropolitan Juhanon Mar Thoma	Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar	India

Canon F. E. Maynard	Church of England in Australia and Tasmania	Australia
Dr. C. P. Morehouse	Protestant Episcopal Church	U.S.A.
Dr. R. E. Nelson	American Baptist Convention	U.S.A.
Dr. H. E. Nicely	Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.	U.S.A.
Rt. Rev. C. M. Nicholson	United Church of Canada	Canada
Dr. M. Niemöller	Evangelical Church in Germany	Germany
Dr. W. Niesel	Evangelical Church in Germany	Germany
Rev. D. T. Niles	Methodist Church in Ceylon	Ceylon
Dr. O. T. Olson	Methodist Church	U.S.A.
Very Rev. A. Ralla Ram	United Church of North India	India
Rt. Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, Bishop of Derby	Church of England	England
Dr. H. Renkewitz	Moravian Church	Germany
Ven. H. W. Rennison	Church of Ireland	Ireland
Dr. J. Schmidt	United Lutheran Church in America	U.S.A.
His Holiness Mar Shimun	Church of the East and of the Assyrians	(U.S.A.)
Prof. E. Sommerlath	Evangelical Church in Germany (Luth.)	Germany
Archpriest S. Timtchenko	Oecumenical Patriarchate	Sweden
Dr. J. M. van Veen	Dutch Reformed Church	Holland
Bishop L. Vetö	Lutheran Church of Hungary	Hungary
Pasteur Ch. Westphal	Reformed Church of France	France
Dr. H. V. White	Congregational Christian Churches	U.S.A.
Dr. D. D. Williams	Congregational Christian Churches	U.S.A.
<i>Consultants</i>		
Fr. H. R. T. Brandreth, O.G.S.	Church of England	England
Fr. A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.	Church of England	England
Dean N. Karlström	Church of Sweden	Sweden
Dr. N. Zernov	Patriarchate of Moscow (Eng- land)	England
<i>Youth Group:</i>		
Mr. W. Lazareth	United Lutheran Church in America	U.S.A.
Mr. M. West	Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland	England
Rev. D. Wilson	Methodist Church in Ceylon	Ceylon

APPENDIX 4

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

(including Report of Press Committee)

★

I. CONFERENCE BUSINESS COMMITTEE WAS COMPOSED OF THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS OF THE CONFERENCE:

Archbishop Y. T. Brilioth, *President of the Conference*

Dr. Douglas Horton, *Vice-President of the Conference*

Dr. P. M. Dawley

Professor H. d'Espine

Bishop H. Lilje

Dr. E. A. Payne

Dr. G. R. Cragg

Fr. K. Philipos

Prof. H. E. W. Turner

Dr. J. Winterhager

Dr. H. van der Linde

Dr. J. R. Nelson

Rev. Marcus Ward

Rev. Russell Chandran

Prof. R. Hettlinger

Rev. J. K. S. Reid

Bishop Angus Dun, *Chairman of Committee on Theme*

Prof. S. F. H. J. Berkelbach v.d. Sprenkel, *Chairman of Committee on Future*

Dr. C. P. Morehouse, *Chairman of Press Committee*

Bishop K. Riches, *Chairman of Worship Committee*

Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, *General Secretary of World Council of Churches*

Dr. R. B. Manikam, *Joint Secretary of World Council of Churches and International Missionary Council*

Rev. O. S. Tomkins

Dr. L. Hodgson

Dr. F. W. Tomkins

and

Prof. G. Florovsky, *co-opted member*

} *Chairmen of Sections*

} *Secretaries of Sections*

} *Secretariat of Faith and Order Commission*

II. FUTURE OF FAITH AND ORDER

Chairman:

Prof. S. F. H. J. Berkelbach Dutch Reformed Church
v.d. Sprenkel

Secretary:

Dr. Perry E. Gresham Disciples of Christ, U.S.A.

Members:

Princ. J. A. Allan Presbyterian Church of New Zealand

Archbishop Athenagoras of Oecumenical Patriarchate of Thyateira Constantinople

Rev. Farid Audeh Evangelical Synod of Syria and Lebanon

Prof. R. Bring Church of Sweden

Rev. Russell Chandran Church of South India

Dr. L. E. Cooke Congregational Union of England and Wales

Dr. G. R. Cragg United Church of Canada

Rev. A. Thakur Das United Church of N. India (Pakistan)

Prof. Dr. David Dunn Evangelical and Reformed Church, U.S.A.

Dr. R. Newton Flew Methodist Church of Great Britain

Dr. H. H. Harms Evangelical Church of Germany (Lutheran)

Prof. R. R. Hartford Church of Ireland

Dean W. G. Muelder Methodist Church, U.S.A.

Dr. Reuben E. Nelson American Baptist Convention

Moderator D. W. Niesel Evangelical Church of Germany

Prof. E. Staehelin Swiss Protestant Church Federation

Pasteur Ch. Westphal Reformed Church of France

Consultant:

Dr. S. McCrea Cavert National Council of Churches of Christ, U.S.A.

Staff:

Dr. Leonard Hodgson
 Dr. Visser 't Hooft
 Rev. O. S. Tomkins
 Dr. J. R. Nelson

III. THEME FOR EVANSTON ASSEMBLY AND POSSIBLE MESSAGE TO THE CHURCHES

Chairman:

Bishop Angus Dun Protestant Episcopal Church,
 U.S.A.

Secretary:

Rev. D. T. Niles Methodist Church in Ceylon

Members:

Percy W. Bartlett	Society of Friends in Great Britain
Prof. C. Bergendoff	Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church, U.S.A.
Dr. R. L. Calhoun	Congregational Christian Churches, U.S.A.
Dr. A. C. Craig	Church of Scotland
Prof. G. Florovsky	Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople (Exarchate for Russians in the West)
Prof. J. Hromádka	Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren
Metropolitan Juhanon Mar Thoma	Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar
Dr. R. J. McCracken	American Baptist Convention
Pasteur Pierre Maury	Reformed Church of France
Kirchenpräsident D. M. Niemöller	Evangelical Church of Germany
Dr. A. C. Outler	Methodist Church, U.S.A.
Prof. A. M. Ramsey	Church of England
Prof. Dr. E. Schlink	Evangelical Church of Germany (Lutheran)
Bishop B. Skard	Church of Norway

Dr. J. M. van Veen
Canon T. O. Wedel

Dutch Reformed Church
Protestant Episcopal Church,
U.S.A.

Consultant:

Dr. T. F. Torrance

Church of Scotland

Staff:

Rev. O. S. Tomkins

Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft

IV. WORSHIP COMMITTEE

Chairman:

Rt. Rev. K. Riches, Bishop of Dorchester

Secretary:

Dr. F. W. Tomkins

Members:

Dr. E. Emmen

Dr. I. Morgan

Dr. O. T. Olson

Dr. E. Pruden

Bishop W. Stählin

Pastor A. J. Werner

V. PRESS COMMITTEE

Chairman:

Dr. C. P. Morehouse

Secretary:

Dr. H. S. Leiper

Members:

Rev. P. Edwall

Prof. E. R. Fairweather

Prof. R. R. Hartford

Rev. K. T. Henderson

Bishop Ivan Lee Holt

Very Rev. Dr. A. Ralla Ram

Archimandrite E. Timiadis

Consultants:

Dr. G. W. Buckner, Jr.

Dr. J. W. Kennedy

Pfarrer Lic. W. Menn

Rev. C. O. Rhodes

Staff:

Mr. T. B. Causton

Mrs. Elsie Culver

Interpreters:

Rev. Paul Griswold Macy

Prof. Carl Michalson

Rev. James Hastings Nichols

REPORT OF PRESS AND PUBLICITY COMMITTEE

I. *Introduction*

Public relations, in such a setting as that of Faith and Order, may properly be considered as a form of Christian evangelism. The concern of the early Christians was to publish the glad tidings of the mighty acts whereby Jesus and His disciples turned the world upside down. In spreading the good news of the Gospel, those early Christians used every means of communication known to the ancient world—the synagogues of the Jews, the market places of the Gentiles, the tradition of the Unknown God at Athens, the paved highways of the Roman Empire, and even the tribunals in which they witnessed to their faith and from which many went to their martyrdom.

Along the broad highways of ancient Rome sped couriers with letters containing news and godly admonitions from Paul to the little groups of Christians at Antioch, at Philippi, at Corinth, and in the imperial city itself. Later, when the hordes of the barbarian north swept down upon Rome, groups of devoted monks, the public relations men of their day, laboriously copied out the good news for their own and future generations. And with the invention of the printing press, the same glad tidings were spread abroad, in the languages of many peoples and races, so that it could be said again, as at the first Pentecost, that every man heard in his own tongue of the wonderful works of God.

So in this day, if the Church would carry its message to the farthest corners of the earth, and so fulfil its divine commission, it must not only preach the Word from its pulpits but must spread it through the religious and secular press, the motion pictures, the radio and television, that again every man may hear through the medium that he best understands, what God is doing through His Church to-day.

A press and publicity committee is therefore indispensable for a conference such as this, and a continuing and effective public relations department is essential to the growth and understanding of the World Council of Churches. We already have such a department, both in Geneva and in New York; and the work of the staff of those departments before and during this conference shows not only what has been done, but what can be done in looking forward to future meetings, such as those to be held in India next winter and in Evanston in 1954, and also in day-to-day publicity between meetings.

II. *Publicity before the Conference*

(A) *Secular Press.* Advance publicity for the conference has been carried out simultaneously from both sides of the Atlantic. Contacts with the daily press in advance of the conference included the following:

(1) A news release was sent out from London, following the Faith and Order Executive meeting at Lambeth Palace in February.

(2) An approach was made (personally or by letter) to leading publishers and heads of press associations to assure the presence at the conference of competent correspondents appointed to cover the programme.

(3) Advance articles appeared in Ecumenical Press Service (six stories).

(4) A series of press communiqués went out through the wire services of Geneva, Paris, Hamburg, Copenhagen, Stockholm and New York (in English, French, German and Swedish). A Danish language press communiqué was issued at a press conference in Copenhagen where members of the World Council Executive Committee reported on their meeting in Denmark and announced plans for Lund.

(5) Several feature articles, with pictures, were syndicated to lists of selected daily papers. The 'non-theological factors' afforded a newspeg on which to hang the overall story of the Faith and Order movement and the coming conference, in popular terms. In some areas local interest was assured by directing publicity to the home town papers of appointed delegates.

(6) An Associated Press feature story brought clippings from over 100 daily papers, indicating very wide circulation—probably several hundred daily newspapers.

(7) A picture story featuring the conference in the historic setting of the Faith and Order movement, as well as its geographic setting at Lund, was syndicated by Religious News Service to their entire list of correspondent newspapers.

(B) *Church Press.* (1) Advance news stories appeared in many church papers, channelled to them through Ecumenical Press Service and through news releases, concerning preparations for Lund. These were sent out from both the Geneva and New York offices. Religion editors were briefed via personal contacts, press communiqués, and via delegates and press committees.

(2) Advance articles appeared in many religious publications, often with pictures. These varied from items based on press communiqués to illustrated feature articles written on request by leading churchmen,

based (in part) on materials made available through the World Council offices.

(3) Six thousand copies of a Lund folder were printed and distributed, primarily through church channels.

III. *Publicity during the Conference*

(1) Over forty special press correspondents were accredited for the plenary sessions, among other countries, from:

Denmark	Norway
Finland	Sweden
France	United Kingdom
Germany	United States

Of these, a limited number were also accredited to attend the section meetings for off-the-record background. Among others, it might be noted that two representatives of the Associated Press have been present throughout the sessions. Associated Press and the British Broadcasting Corporation both had direct wires to the conference.

(2) Press conferences and briefing sessions for the press have been held almost daily, arranged by the chairman of the Press Committee. The wishes of the press have been followed so far as possible, as to whom they wished to interview. Conference and section heads have given generously of their time to make these meetings successful.

(3) Ecumenical Press Service was supplied with full coverage.

(4) Press communiqués (in four languages) were—

(a) issued for reporters covering the conference.

(b) mailed to both church and secular press agencies and periodicals in countries as far afield as Australia, New Zealand, India, North and South America (for the western hemisphere, material is remimeographed and distributed from the New York Office of the World Council).

(5) Telephone reports have been 'phoned through Stockholm and Copenhagen to press outlets for world-wide dissemination, and cabled reports transmitted to Religious News Service, New York.

(6) Special exclusive or syndicated articles have been prepared, as requested, for various church publications.

(7) Assistance has been given to delegates who are acting as correspondents for their own Churches or countries. We plan to provide all delegates with a summary of the conference on the final day, for their use as source material.

IV. *Radio*

(A) *Before the Conference.* Among the advance programmes of which we have been informed, we might especially mention the following:

(1) The British Broadcasting Corporation carried a series of worship programmes featuring various ways of worship; also a series of preparatory talks, and reviews of the most important pre-Lund literature.

(2) An introductory broadcast for German listeners was arranged with Nordwestdeutsche Rundfunk and recorded by Professor Schlink for transmission at the opening of the Conference. Other German broadcasts were planned.

(3) The news desk of the networks and largest radio stations in the United States received advance notices and requests for advance mentions concerning the conference. A 'non-theological' (fifteen-minute) dramatic programme in the context of the Faith and Order Conference was aired over 250 United States stations on the National Council's 'Let there be Light' programme during the week of August 11. Listener participation was promoted through church channels.

(B) *At the Conference.* (1) A representative of the B.B.C. has been present throughout the conference and has had over seventy interviews and made many recordings which will be broadcast following the conference. B.B.C.'s News Division has also received daily press releases and comments which have been generally used on news programmes. Several talks have been broadcast on the Radio Newsreel, the German Section and the European Division. Material has been prepared for a fifteen-minute general overseas services programme for English-speaking people throughout the world for September 7. The Home Service aired a forty-minute worship programme at 7.15 Sunday evening (August 24). This broadcast included recorded extracts from the Conference and ended with a prayer for Christian Unity in which audience participation was invited. This programme was also carried by British Regions of the Basic Home Service. The B.B.C. has also made definite arrangements for important broadcasting following the conference to tie in with the Faith and Order theme. Broadcast interviews have also been recorded by correspondents of Swedish Radio (Radiotjänst), Radio Free Europe and the Dutch network.

(2) Several independent recordings have been made during the conference for use on various stations.

(3) Arrangement has also been made for stock-piling the talks recorded by B.B.C. for use by local stations and by religious broadcasters in the United States, during the post-Lund period. Several

recordings have been made for immediate use by the Protestant Episcopal Church at their General Convention. Through the facilities of the division of broadcasting and films of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. provision has been made for at least one television programme—a panel discussion over a nation-wide television network.

It is expected that many delegates will make radio appearances upon their return to their own countries and that the regular news releases will find their way into radio news summaries all over the world.

V. *Visual*

It is planned to make a Faith and Order filmstrip which will be available to all member Churches of the World Council. Some Churches are planning their own strip.

VI. *Conclusion*

If the findings of the Lund Conference are to make the widest possible impact on the Christian world, the publicity cannot be left solely to the staff, or to a committee. Each delegate and visitor might well constitute himself a committee of one, to make the ecumenical message known to all with whom he may come into contact.

CLIFFORD P. MOREHOUSE, *Chairman, Press Committee.*

APPENDIX 5

ANALYSIS OF CONFERENCE INTO
CONFESSIONS, GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS
AND CATEGORIES

★

(A) CONFESSIONS

	<i>Churches</i>	<i>Delegates</i>
Anglican	11	31
Baptist	6	12
Congregational	6	10
Disciples	3	6
Friends	5	5
Lutheran	17	44
Methodist	13	25
Old Catholic	2	2
Orthodox	5	9
Other Eastern	4	4
Presbyterian and Reformed	26	48
United	7	19
Unclassified	9	10
<i>Total Churches</i>	<u>114</u>	<i>Total Delegates</i> <u>225</u>

NOTE: *Churches whose appointed delegates were unable to be present at Lund (and are therefore not included in the above figures):*

Church in Wales	2
Churches of Christ in Australia	1
Patriarchate of Alexandria	1
Eglise Evangélique Luthérienne de France	1
Church of Greece	6
Churches of Christ in Great Britain	1
Polish National Catholic Church of America	1
Orthodox Patriarchate of Serbia	2
<i>Churches:</i>	<u>8</u>
<i>Delegates:</i>	<u>15</u>

(B) GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

	<i>Churches</i>	<i>Delegates</i>
Asia	15	23
Australia and New Zealand	8	8
Africa	8	8
Near East	7	10
Europe	31	69
United Kingdom	13	35
North America	29	69
South America	3	3
	—	—
	114	225
	—	—

(C) CATEGORIES

Official Delegates from Churches	225
Consultants	22
Special Consultants	5
Fraternal Visitors	10
Staff Consultants	13
Youth Group	19
Observers from the Roman Catholic Church	4
	—
	298
	—

Also some 80 Accredited Visitors.

APPENDIX 6

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION¹



(*Note:* Early in the Conference a Committee was appointed to consider the future organisation of the Faith and Order Commission. Its findings, which were accepted on August 25 by the Conference *nemine contradicente*, took the form of amendments to the Faith and Order Constitution drawn up in 1948, in so far as proposed organisational changes involved the alteration of existing clauses. The Constitution, thus amended, is here printed in full in the form in which it was referred to the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches at Lucknow in January 1953. Final amendment and adoption wait upon the Evanston Assembly of August 1954.)

Title

1. The Commission shall be called the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches.

Meanings

2. In this Constitution:

The Commission means the above-named Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches.

The Working Committee means the Working Committee of the Commission on Faith and Order.

The Council means the above-named World Council of Churches.

The Assembly means the Assembly of the World Council.

The Central Committee means the Central Committee of the World Council.

Functions

3. The functions of the Commission are:

(i) To proclaim the essential oneness of the Church of Christ and to keep prominently before the World Council and the

¹ The English text is definitive. Translations into German and French will be produced later.

Churches the obligation to manifest that unity and its urgency for the work of evangelism.

(ii) To study questions of faith, order and worship with the relevant social, cultural, political, racial and other factors in their bearing on the unity of the Church.

(iii) To study the theological implications of the existence of the ecumenical movement.

(iv) To study matters in the present relationships of the Churches to one another which cause difficulties and need theological clarification.

(v) To provide information concerning actual steps taken by the Churches towards reunion.

4. All activities of the Commission shall be in accordance with the four principles of the Faith and Order Movement, viz.:

(i) Its main work is to draw Churches out of isolation into conference, in which none is to be asked to be disloyal to or to compromise its convictions, but to seek to explain them to others while seeking to understand their points of view. Irreconcilable differences are to be recorded as honestly as agreements. (ii) Its conferences are to be conferences of delegates officially appointed by the Churches to represent them. (iii) The invitation to take part in these conferences is addressed to all Christian Churches throughout the world which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. (iv) Only Churches themselves are competent to take actual steps towards reunion by entering into negotiations with one another. The work of the Movement is not to formulate schemes and tell the Churches what they ought to do, but to act as the handmaid of the Churches in the preparatory work of clearing away misunderstandings, discussing obstacles to reunion, and issuing reports which are submitted to the Churches for their consideration.

Organisation

5. (i) World Conferences on Faith and Order are to be held when main subjects are ready for submission to the Churches, and when, on recommendation of the Commission on Faith and Order, the Central Committee so decides.

(ii) The Commission on Faith and Order shall consist of 85 members appointed by the Assembly of the World Council, with

power to nominate additional members up to the number of 15 for appointment by the Central Committee, all these to hold office until the next Assembly (subject, however, to any revision advised by a World Conference on Faith and Order as hereinafter provided). At each Assembly the list of membership shall be revised in the light of recommendations made by the Commission. When a World Conference is held, it shall advise the Central Committee on any necessary revision of the membership of the Commission between that Conference and the next Assembly. In making appointments care shall be taken to secure the adequate geographical and confessional representation of Churches.

The Commission may include members of Churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour but are not members of the World Council.

Vacancies shall be filled by the Central Committee on the recommendation of the Commission.

Before appointments are made, steps shall be taken to ensure that the appointments proposed are acceptable to the Churches concerned.

(iii) The Commission shall normally meet every three years but may be called together at any time when major theological commission reports need to be reviewed by a larger body than the Working Committee.

(iv) The Commission shall nominate from its own members, for appointment by the Central Committee, a Working Committee of not more than 22 members with power to nominate not more than 3 additional members. The Working Committee shall normally meet annually and shall be responsible (a) for administration, (b) for directing the study work and other activities of Faith and Order and (c) for co-operation with other agencies of the World Council.

Vacancies in the Working Committee shall be filled by the Working Committee itself from the membership of the Commission and submitted to the Central Committee for appointment.

(v) There shall be various theological commissions set up by the Commission or Working Committee. Theological commissions may include as members or consultants persons who are not members of the Commission.

Meetings of the Commission

6. The Chairman of the Commission, or in his absence the Vice-Chairman, shall preside at meetings of the Commission. In the absence of these officers, the meeting shall elect its own Chairman. One-sixth of the total membership shall constitute a quorum.

7. The notices of meetings shall be issued by the Secretary.

8. Members of the Commission can name substitutes to represent them at meetings at which they are unable to be present themselves.

9. On questions of Faith and Order the Commission shall not adopt any resolutions, but shall confine itself to recording for the information of the Churches such agreements and disagreements as are discovered.

10. Questions of procedure and the conduct of the business of the Commission shall be decided by a majority vote of those present and voting.

11. The Working Committee may, either at a meeting of the Commission or previously, determine the rules of procedure and of debate for the meeting.

12. Persons not being members of the Commission may be invited by the Chairman or the Secretary to be present and speak, but they cannot vote.

Chairman

13. The Chairman shall be elected by a majority of votes at a duly convened meeting of the Commission, on the nomination of the Working Committee.

14. The Chairman shall hold office for three years from the date of his appointment, but shall be eligible for re-election.

15. In the event of the office of Chairman falling vacant by reason of resignation, incapacity or death, the Vice-Chairman shall act as Chairman of the Commission until such time as a meeting of the Commission can be called.

Vice-Chairman

16. A Vice-Chairman shall be elected by the Commission on the nomination of the Working Committee, shall hold office for three years, and shall be eligible for re-election.

The Secretariat

17. There shall be at least one Secretary who shall be a member of the staff of the Council employed for the work of the Commission on a full-time basis.

18. The Secretary or Secretaries shall be nominated by the Commission to the Central Committee.

19. It shall be the special responsibility of the Secretary to maintain full consultation and co-operation with the General Secretariat and with the other Departments of the Council, and particularly with the Study Department.

20. The salaries or honoraria to be paid to the Secretary or Secretaries shall be determined by the Working Committee and the officers of the Council in consultation.

The Working Committee

21. The Commission shall appoint the Chairman of the Working Committee.

22. Members of the Working Committee shall hold office until the next meeting of the Commission, when the list of membership shall be revised.

23. The Working Committee shall have power to act on behalf of the Commission in all matters where action is required before a meeting of the Commission can be convened.

24. The Working Committee shall meet at such times and places as the Chairman and the Secretary shall decide to be required for the performance of its duty.

25. The quorum for a meeting of the Working Committee shall be seven members present, of whom at least three must be elected members.

26. If at any time when it is inconvenient to convene a meeting the Chairman and Secretary shall decide that there is business needing an immediate decision by the Working Committee, it shall be permissible for them to obtain by post the opinions of its members and the majority opinion thus ascertained shall be treated as equivalent to the decision of a duly convened meeting.

The Department

27. The Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretaries, Chairman of the Working Committee and the Chairmen of Theological

Commissions shall together be known as the Council's Faith and Order Department.

28. The Department shall be responsible for continuously carrying on the work of the Commission between meetings of the Commission and the Working Committee, both by (i) promoting the studies of the Theological Commissions and (ii) following all developments in the matter of the union of Churches and keeping all the Churches informed of these developments. It shall maintain full consultation and co-operation with the Study Department of the Council.

29. The Secretaries shall be the only officers of the Commission employed by the Council on a full-time basis; the other members of the Department shall be persons giving part-time service to the Commission whilst being also actively engaged in the service of their own Churches.

The Theological Commissions

30. The work of the Theological Commissions shall be to prepare reports which may serve as the basis for discussion in the Commission, at the Assemblies of the World Council, or at Conferences on Faith and Order, on the subjects referred to them under § 5 (v) above.

31. Each Theological Commission shall be composed of a Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary with other members chosen for their special competence in the particular field of study and representing as wide a variety as possible of ecclesiastical traditions. The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary shall be appointed by the Commission, and they shall then select and appoint the other members in consultation with the Secretary.

The Budget

32. The Commission's financial year shall run from 1st January to 31st December.

33. An annual budget of expenditure shall be drawn up by the Secretary in consultation with the Finance Committee of the Council; it shall be submitted to the Working Committee for its approval and when so approved shall be submitted to the Council for final adoption. Copies shall then be sent to all members of the Commission.

34. The budget shall specify the amount allocated for the expenses of each Theological Commission, and each Theological Commission shall be responsible for deciding its manner of using its allocation within the limit prescribed in the budget.

Revision

35. Any amendment to this Constitution must be approved by the Assembly or Central Committee of the Council, but no amendment shall be valid which contravenes the provisions of paragraph 4 above or of this paragraph.

Interim Arrangement

The Commission on Faith and Order shall consist of 85 members nominated by the Lund Conference to the Central Committee for appointment, with power to nominate additional members up to the number of 15, all these to hold office until the next Assembly of the World Council, at which the list of membership shall be revised in the light of recommendations made by the Commission.

APPENDIX 7

MEMBERS OF THE FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION

★

(*Signifies elected as a member of the Working Committee by the new Commission at its first meeting on the afternoon of August 28, 1952)

Chairman: The Most Rev. Y. T. Brilioth (Church of Sweden), Uppsala, Sweden.

Vice-Chairman: ★Dean C. T. Craig, D.D. (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), Drew University, Madison, New Jersey, U.S.A.

Secretary: The Rev. Dr. J. Robert Nelson (from June, 1953), Conseil Oecuménique des Eglises, 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland.

Associate Secretary in America: The Rev. Dr. F. W. Tomkins, St. John's Rectory, Washington, Conn., U.S.A.

MEMBERS:

Bishop A. J. ALLEN (African Methodist Episcopal Church, U.S.A.), 2193 East 89th Street, Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A.

Princ. H. B. AMSTUTZ (Methodist Church in S.E. Asia), 50 Barker Road, Singapore 11, Malaya.

Most Rev. Archbishop ATHENAGORAS, Metropolitan of Thyateira (Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, Exarchate in Western Europe), 8 Dawson Place, London, W.2, England.

Rev. Farid AUDEH (Evangelical Synod of Syria and Lebanon), c/o American Mission, P.O. Box 235, Beirut, Lebanon.

Rev. Professor D. M. BAILLIE (Church of Scotland), The Crask, St. Andrews, Fife, Scotland.

Bishop S. U. BARBIERI (Methodist Church in Argentina), Camacua 282, Buenos Aires 6, Argentina.

Most Rev. W. F. BARFOOT, Primate of All Canada (Church of England in Canada), 10029 103rd Street, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

*Mr. Percy W. BARTLETT (Society of Friends in Great Britain), 120 Southsea Avenue, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex, England.

- Rev. Dr. Conrad BERGENDOFF (Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church, U.S.A.), 835 35th Street, Rock Island, Illinois, U.S.A.
- Dr. H. BERKHOF (Dutch Reformed Church), Driebergen, Horstlaan 3, The Netherlands.
- Dr. J. H. BODENSIECK (American Lutheran Church), 138 Clay Allee, Berlin-Dahlem, Germany (Home: Dubuque, Iowa, U.S.A.).
- *Professor J. R. CHANDRAN (Church of South India), United Theological College, 17 Millers Road, Bangalore 1, South India.
- Rev. Principal H. F. Lovell COCKS (Congregational Union of England and Wales), Western College, 1 Cotham Road, Bristol 6, England.
- Rev. Dr. G. R. CRAGG (United Church of Canada), 3407 Ontario Avenue, Montreal 25, Canada.
- Rev. Marcos DAUD (Coptic Orthodox Church), P.O. Box 6, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Professor V. E. DEVADUTT (Baptist), Serampore Christian College, Bengal, India.
- *Rt. Rev. Bishop Angus DUN (Protestant Episcopal Church, U.S.A.), Bishop's House, Mount Saint Alban, Washington 16, D.C., U.S.A.
- Rev. S. DURAIKAN (Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches of India), c/o Bishop's Office, Tranquebar House, Tiruchiripalle, South India.
- Dean S. J. ENGLAND (Disciples of Christ, U.S.A.), 2202 East Maple Avenue, Enid, Oklahoma, U.S.A.
- *Rev. Professor H. d'ESPINE (Swiss Protestant Church Federation), 2 avenue de Combes, Geneva, Switzerland.
- *Rev. Principal R. Newton FLEW (Methodist Church of Great Britain), Principal's Lodge, Wesley House, Cambridge, England.
- *Professor G. FLOROVSKY (Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, Exarchate for Russians in the West), 537 West 121st Street, New York City 27, U.S.A.
- *President H. GEZORK (American Baptist Convention), 196 Herrick Road, Newton Centre, Mass., U.S.A.
- Professor D. GLUMAÇ (Orthodox Patriarchate of Serbia), Cara Lazara 16, Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

- Rev. Principal J. GRAY (Churches of Christ), Overdale College, Selly Oak, Birmingham 29, England.
- *President Perry E. GRESHAM (Disciples of Christ, U.S.A.), Pendleton Heights, Bethany College, Bethany, W. Virginia, U.S.A.
- Bishop E. G. GULIN (Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland), Tampere, Finland.
- *Rev. Professor R. R. HARTFORD (Church of Ireland), 39 Trinity College, Dublin, Eire.
- U BA HMYIN (Burma Baptist Convention), American Baptist Mission, 143 St. John's Road, Rangoon, Burma.
- Rev. Dr. L. HODGSON (Church of England), Christ Church, Oxford, England.
- Bishop Ivan Lee HOLT (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), 20 North Kingshighway, St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A.
- Dr. Douglas HORTON (Congregational Christian Churches, U.S.A.), 287 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Professor J. HROMADKA (Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren), Moravska 47, Prague XII, Czechoslovakia.
- *Dr. G. JACOB (Evangelical Church in Germany), Cottbus, Klosterplatz 1, Germany, Eastern Zone.
- *Metropolitan JUHANON MAR THOMA (Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar), Tiruvalla P.O., Travancore, South India.
- *Dr. T. A. KANTONEN (United Lutheran Church in America), 954 Pythian Avenue, Springfield, Ohio, U.S.A.
- Professor Dr. E. KINDER (Evangelical Church in Germany), (13a) Neuendettelsau, Waldstrasse 7, Germany.
- Rev. D. B. KNOX (Church of England in Australia), Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, England.
- *Professor C. KONSTANTINIDIS (Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople), Üsküdar, Allâme Caddesi 82, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Mr. C. T. LEQUESNE (Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland), Rickford Lodge, Admiral's Walk, London, N.W.3, England.
- Bishop Hanns LILJE (Evangelical Church in Germany: Lutheran), Hannover, Calenbergerstrasse 43, Germany.
- President Dr. J. A. MACKAY (Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.), 86 Mercer Street, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.

- *Rev. Principal John MARSH (Congregational Union of England and Wales), Mansfield College, Oxford, England.
- Pastor P. MAURY (Reformed Church of France), 11 Avenue du Colonel Bonnet, Paris 16me, France.
- Rt. Rev. Bishop Lakdasa DE MEL (Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon), Bishop's House, Kurunagala, Ceylon.
- Dr. P. S. MINEAR (Congregational Christian Churches, U.S.A.), 75 Pleasant Street, Newton Center 59, Mass., U.S.A.
- Dr. C. P. MOREHOUSE (Protestant Episcopal Church, U.S.A.), 14 East 41st Street, New York City 17, U.S.A.
- Dr. R. E. NELSON (American Baptist Convention), 152 Madison Avenue, New York City 16, U.S.A.
- Rt. Rev. Bishop J. E. L. NEWBIGIN (Church of South India), Tallakulam, Mathurai, South India.
- Dr. W. NIESEL (Evangelical Church in Germany), Schölller, Post Dornap, Germany.
- Rev. D. T. NILES (Methodist Church in Ceylon), 709 Maradana Road, Colombo 10, Ceylon.
- President J. NØRGAARD (Baptist Union of Denmark), Tølløse, Denmark.
- Bishop A. NYGREN (Church of Sweden), Lund, Sweden.
- Rev. Professor A. C. OUTLER (Methodist Church, U.S.A.), Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas 5, Texas, U.S.A.
- Archimandrite PARTHENIOS (Patriarchate of Alexandria), Patriarcat Orthodoxe Grec, Alexandria, Egypt.
- *Rev. Dr. E. A. PAYNE (Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland), Baptist Church House, 4 Southampton Row, London, W.C.1, England.
- Rev. Father K. PHILIPOS (Orthodox Syrian Church of Malabar), Orthodox Theological Seminary, Kottayam, Travancore, South India.
- Rt. Rev. A. M. RAMSEY, Bishop of Durham (Church of England), Auckland Castle, Co. Durham, England.
- Rt. Rev. A. E. J. RAWLINSON, Bishop of Derby (Church of England), Breadsall Mount, Derby, England.
- Lic. H. G. RENKEWITZ (Moravian Church, Germany), Bad Boll über Göppingen, Württemberg, Germany.

- Most Rev. Archbishop A. RINKEL (Old Catholic Church of Holland), Utrecht, Emmalaan 8, The Netherlands.
- Dr. Preston T. ROBERTS, Jnr. (General Conference of the Society of Friends), 5619 S. Dorchester Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois, U.S.A.
- *Professor E. W. L. SCHLINK (Evangelical Church in Germany), Heidelberg, Eckenerstrasse 1, Germany.
- Rev. Professor A. SCHMEMANN (Russian Orthodox Church of North America), 537 West 121st Street, New York City 27, U.S.A.
- His Holiness Mar SHIMUN (Church of the East and the Assyrians, U.S.A.), The Patriarchate, 6346 N. Sheridan Road, Chicago 40, Illinois, U.S.A.
- Bishop B. SKARD (Church of Norway), Nedre Langgt. 7, Tønsberg, Norway.
- *Professor K. E. SKYDSGAARD (Church of Denmark), St. Kan-nikestrade 11, Copenhagen, K., Denmark.
- Rev. Dr. T. M. TAYLOR (United Presbyterian Church of North America), Pittsburgh-Zenia Theological Seminary, 616 W. North Avenue, Pittsburgh 12, Penn., U.S.A.
- Dr. J. Newton THOMAS (Presbyterian Church in the U.S.), 1002 Westwood Avenue, Richmond 27, Virginia, U.S.A.
- Most Rev. Archbishop TIRAN (Nersoyan) (Armenian Church of America), 630 Second Avenue, New York City 16, U.S.A.
- *Rev. Dr. O. S. TOMKINS (Church of England), The Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln, England. *Chairman of Working Committee.*
- *Rev. Professor T. F. TORRANCE, M.B.E. (Church of Scotland), 21 South Oswald Road, Edinburgh 9, Scotland.
- *Professor L. J. TRINTERUD (Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.), 2330 North Halsted Street, Chicago 14, Illinois, U.S.A.
- Bishop L. VETÖ (Lutheran Church of Hungary), Lutherutca 14, Nyiregyhaza, Hungary.
- Rev. Dr. H. WATKIN-JONES (Methodist Church of Great Britain), Redcliffe, North Grange Road, Headingley, Leeds, England.
- *Professor G. F. WINGREN (Church of Sweden), Pålsjövägen 14, Lund, Sweden.
- Dr. J. W. WINTERHAGER (Evangelical Church in Germany), Heimat 27, Berlin-Zehlendorf, Germany.

Rt. Rev. M. H. YASHIRO (Anglican Church in Japan), 5 Nakayamate-dori, 3-chome, Ikutaku, Kobe, Japan.

Professor L. ZANDER (Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople: Exarchate for Russians in the West), 4 rue d'Alsace Lorraine, Boulogne-sur-Seine, France.

Plus: 1 South African Reformed, 1 representative from the Church of Christ in Japan and 2 representatives from the Church of Greece, to be named later.

INDEX OF NAMES

★

- AGATHONIKOS, Metrop. of Kalavryta, 105
- Alivisatos, H. S., 73, 105
- Allen, Bishop, 94, 235
- Ambrosius, Metrop. of Phthiotis, 105
- Amstutz, H. B., 285
- Applegate, A. W., 235
- Armagh, Archbishop of. *See* Gregg.
- Arndt, J., 291
- Athenagoras, Archbishop, 123-6, 288, 312
- d'Aubigné, M., 97
- Audeh, F., 216-22, 284-5, 311
- Augustine, St., 140
- Aulén, Bishop, 75
- Azariah, Bishop, 97, 219
- BAILLIE, D. M., 73, 79, 102, 112, 139-44
- Barfoot, Archbishop, 139
- Bate, H. N., 97
- Bereczky, Bishop, 94
- Berkelbach v. d. Sprengel, S.F.H.J., 230
- Bhatty, E. C., 300, 311
- Bildt, Baron H., 97
- Blake, E. C., 234
- Bodensieck, J. H., 283f.
- Boegner, M., 72, 75
- Bolander, Dean, 139, 145-6
- Boulgakow, S., 97
- Brent, Bishop, 95, 97, 165, 182, 207, 315
- Brilioth, Archbishop, 73, 74, 75, 95ff., 182, 286, 287, 288-94, 309, 312f., 314-15, 316
- Brinton, H. H., 94
- Brown, W. A., 97
- Bultmann, R., 195
- CALHOUN, R. L., 244-5, 299
- Chandran, J. R., 287, 311
- Choisy, E., 97
- Cooke, L. E., 94, 235, 302
- Couturier, Abbé, 108
- Cragg, G. R., 174, 236, 298, 299, 303
- Craig, C. T., 78, 102, 106, 113, 312
- Cranswick, Bishop, 108
- DAS, A. T., 311
- Davidson, N., 285
- Dawley, P. M., 236
- Deissmann, A., 97
- Derby, Bishop of. *See* Rawlinson.
- Devanandan, P. D., 311
- Dodd, C. H., 77, 103, 174, 184
- Dorchester, Bishop of. *See* Riches.
- Dun, Bishop, 300-1, 304-5, 315-16
- Duraikan, S., 94
- EDMONTON, Archbishop of. *See* Barfoot.
- Edwall, P., 113
- Eidem, Archbishop, 96
- Ellul, J., 174
- England, S. J., 231f., 261
- d'Espine, H., 83, 247
- Every, G., 180
- FAIRWEATHER, E. R., 284
- Fischer, F., 252
- Fisher, Archbishop, 130, 168
- Flew, R. N., 70, 71, 73, 75, 78, 95f., 102, 225, 288
- Florovsky, G., 94, 124, 243, 252f., 274
- Foster, J., 205
- GAGNIER, P., 261
- Gardiner, R. H., 97
- Garrison, W. E., 183-92
- Garvie, A. E., 97

- German, Bishop, 108
 Germanos, Archbishop, 75
 Glubokovskij, N., 97
 Gregg, Archbishop, 106
 Gresham, P. E., 139
 Grünberg, Archbishop, 106
 Gustaf Adolf, King of Sweden, 108
 288
- HAGAN, E. J., 70, 112
 Harms, H. H., 94
 Hartford, R. R., 232
 Hayman, E., 113, 235, 272-3
 Headlam, Bishop, 97, 101
 Hebert, A. G., 273-4
 Hedar, J., 288
 Henderson, K. T., 252
 Hodgson, L., 71, 73, 75, 103, 107,
 109-22, 126-8, 227-30, 231, 233-5,
 295, 296, 308, 314
 Holt, Bishop, 83
 Horton, D., 75, 108, 253, 288, 316-19
 Hove, J., 287
 Hromádka, J., 192-8, 245
- JOANNIDES, B., 105
 John, E., 311
 Johnson, J. A., 246-7, 284
 Juhanon Mar Thoma, Metrop., 94, 297
- KANTONEN, T. A., 298, 299
 Karmiris, J., 105
 Kelman, John, 139f.
 Kerr, H. T., 71, 113
 Kinder, E., 262
 Knox, D. B., 274
 Konstantinidis, C. E., 124
 Kurunagala, Bishop of. *See* De Mel.
- LACTANTIUS, 189
 van der Leeuw, G., 71, 73, 78, 97, 102,
 113, 171
 Lehtonen, Archbishop, 97
 Leiper, H. S., 204-8, 309
 Lennox, R., 303
 LeQuésne, C. T., 233
 Lilje, Bishop, 83, 295, 344
 Locke, John, 188, 189
- Loti, Pierre, 140
 Lowry, C. W., 71, 113
 Lund-Quist, C., 287
- MACCRACKEN, J. H., 70
 McCracken, R. J., 94
 Macdonald, A. J., 235, 274
 Mackinnon, D. M., 245, 274-5
 Mangalam, J., 94
 Manikam, R. B., 209-14, 311
 Manning, Bishop, 97
 Marsh, J., 102, 112
 Maury, P., 94, 202-3
 Maxwell, W. D., 113
 Maynard, F. E., 94
 De Mel, Bishop, 83-7, 311
 Meyer, H. J. A., 284
 Minear, P. S., 274
 Morehouse, C. P., 309-10
 Morgan, I., 94
 Morrison, S. A., 221
 Mott, J. R., 207
 Muto, T., 311
- NEILL, Bishop, 13, 220
 Nelson, J. R., 313
 Nelson, R. E., 284
 Newman, H., 291
 Nichols, Bishop, 235
 Niebuhr, Richard, 205
 Niesel, W., 247
 Niles, D. T., 215-16, 246, 285, 299,
 303, 311
 Nolde, O. F., 207
 Nygren, Bishop, 76, 144, 146-50, 187,
 287, 295, 299
- OBENDIEK, H., 175-83, 273
 Olsen, O. T., 94
- PANTELEIMON, Metrop. of Salonica, 105
 Parvin, W. R., 74
 Parvio, M., 94
 Paton, W., 205
 Payne, E. A., 275-6, 295, 302f.
 Péter, Bishop, 199-202
 Philipos, K., 139
 Photiadès, E., 124

- Poladian, Bishop, 313
 Pouw, B.-G., 233
- RAM, A. R., 296, 311
 Ramsey, A. M., 262f., 284, 303
 Rawlinson, Bishop, 285, 303, 313-14
 Renkewitz, H., 94
 Repanellis, M., 124
 Richards, G. W., 71, 113, 225
 Riches, Bishop, 102, 245-6
 Rinkel, Archbishop, 139, 285
 Ross, J. M., 285, 296
- SASSE, H., 108
 Schlink, E., 151-61, 162, 220, 285
 Schmemann, A., 287
 Schmidt, K. D., 180
 Söderblom, Archbishop, 85, 96, 99,
 133
 Soloviev, V., 153
 Spyridon, Archbishop, 105, 124
 Stählin, Bishop, 288
 Stevenson, J. R., 97
 Symonds, H. E., 271
- TATLOW, T., 74
 Temple, Archbishop, 69, 73, 96, 97,
 133, 204, 206
 Tertullian, 189
- Thomas, J. N., 94
 Thurian, M., 94
 Timiadis, E., 124
 Tomkins, F. W., 73, 75, 103, 107, 314f.
 Tomkins, O. S., 73, 74, 75, 99, 101,
 103, 107, 161-73, 312, 314, 316
 Torrance, T. F., 56, 273
 Turner, H. E. W., 299
- UPSALA, Archbishop of. *See* Brilioth.
- VISSER 'T HOOFT, W. A., 128-38, 200,
 205, 303
 Vos, W., 102
- WARD, M., 263-4, 301, 344
 Washington, Bishop of. *See* Dun.
 Wedel, T. O., 205
 West, M., 305
 White, H. V., 94
 Williams, D. D., 232, 262
 Wilson, D., 311
 Winterhager, J., 300
- ZABRISKIE, G., 97
 Zander, L., 124
 Zinzendorf, 291
 Zoellner, W., 97

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

(*Italic page numbers refer to the Draft Reports*)



- AMERICAN FAITH AND ORDER COMMITTEE, 174
American Theological Committee, 71, 102
Amsterdam Assembly, 74-5, 99, 129, 133, 139, 216
 Report, 74, 75, 102, 103, 133, 158, 165, 172
Anglicans, 52, 55, 58, 119, 168, 222, 233, 271, 275, 278, 284, 285
Apostasy, 29-30, 247, 250*f.*
Apostolic Succession, 26, 75, 116, 248, 255, 266
Arians, 180
- BAPTISM, 21, 23, 48, 56, 114, 158-9
Baptists, 115, 222, 284
- CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT, 75, 114, 116, 193, 308
Christ and the Church, 17-22, 24, 33
Christology, 12, 26, 156, 173, 181, 197, 246, 285, 295-6, 297, 298
Church, American Committee Report on, 71
 Amsterdam Section on, 74, 75, 103, 156, 158
 Doctrine of, 27, 58, 60, 78
 Nature of, 15, 18, 19, 51, 74, 75, 103, 112*f.*, 116, 129, 187
 Report and volume on, 11, 24, 34, 61, 64, 164, 166, 172, 243, 247, 262-3
 and State, 35, 178*f.*, 185*ff.*, 193, 195
 Theological Commission on, 60, 70, 76, 78, 102, 111
 The Church in the Purpose of God, 77
- The Church, the Churches and the W.C.C.* See Toronto Statement.
Commission on Faith and Order (1948-52), 74, 76, 79
 elected at Lund, 309, 312-13, 366-71
 organisation after Lund, 80, 127-8, 202, 225-35
 place in the World Council, 79, 99*f.*, 127*f.*, 128-37, 156, 163, 226*ff.*, 231, 315
Committee of Fourteen, 69, 73, 99
Committee of Thirty-five, 73
Communion, 23, 42-3, 47, 49*ff.*, 71, 114, 139-50, 160, 221, 267, 271, 275-86
 at ecumenical gatherings, 57-8
 open and closed communion, 51, 52, 53
 sacrificial element in, 42-3
Communism, 196-7, 202, 206, 217
Confessional consciousness, 61-2, 167-8, 297, 307
 organisations, 101
Congregationalists, 26, 52, 117, 221, 222, 278
Constitution of Faith and Order Commission, 11-12, 74, 75, 226*f.*, 230-5, 315, 359-65
 of World Council of Churches, 69, 73, 100, 157
Continuity of the Church, 23*ff.*, 115*f.*, 117, 228, 247, 248, 252*f.*
Councils, Ecumenical, 31
Creeds, Ecumenical, 31
- DENOMINATIONS, 28-9, 30, 163, 167*ff.*, 190

- Disciples of Christ, 222
 Disunity, nature of, 28-9
 sin of, 27-8, 143f.
- ECCLESIOLOGY, 130, 135, 164, 165f.,
 181, 245-6, 284, 285
Ecumenical History, 99
 Ecumenical Institute, 48
Ecumenical Review, 77, 103, 164, 205
 Edinburgh Conference, 12, 13, 39, 69,
 98, III, 133, 192, 205, 229, 296
 Continuation Committee, 69, 74,
 99, 100, 227
 Report, 34, 36, 49, 51, 69, 101, III,
 258, 259, 276, 277
 Episcopacy, 25-6, 253, 255
 Established Churches. *See* Church and
 State.
 Eschatology, 26, 43, 101, 131f., 136,
 151ff., 160, 172, 203, 228
 Eucharist. *See* Communion.
 Evangelism, 31, 36, 45, 46, 64; *and see*
 Mission of the Church.
 Evanston Assembly, 103, 128ff., 194,
 227
 Faith and Order theme for, 128,
 132ff., 304-5
- FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION. *See*
 Commission on Faith and Order
Foi et Vie, 79
 Friends, Society of, 40, 118, 221, 222
 Future tasks of Faith and Order, 12, 27,
 34-7, 38, 42, 44, 46, 47-8, 56,
 59, 156
- GATHERED CHURCHES, 115, 117, 186ff.
 German Evangelical Church, 105, 178
 Greece, Church of, 105
- HEIDELBERG CATECHISM, 183
 Heresy, 27, 30, 180, 190, 247, 248f.,
 250f.
 Hope, Christian, 131, 136
 Hungarian Reformed Church, 199
- INTERCOMMUNION, 49-59, 221, 259,
 264, 273
 American Section on, 71
 Report and volume on, 11, 53, 56,
 57
 Theological Commission on, 49, 70,
 79, 102, 112, 139, 171, 280, 282
 International Missionary Council, 106,
 130, 170, 182, 204, 207, 218,
 219, 222-4, 283
- Kerygma*, 30
Koinonia, 30, 51
- LAUSANNE CONFERENCE, 12, 95, 98,
 101, 192, 296
 Report, 26, 99, 159, 256
 Life and Work movement, 69, 73, 99,
 107, 129, 156, 204f., 229
 Liturgical forms of worship, 41, 46, 47,
 266, 269, 273, 274
 movements, 47, 112, 155, 270, 272
 Lord's Supper. *See* Communion.
 Lund Conference:
 Committees—Business, 348
 Committee on Future of Faith and
 Order, 128, 349-50
 Press Committee, 108, 301, 309-10,
 351-6
 Committee on Theme and Message,
 300-1, 304-5, 350-1
 Worship Committee, 108, 139, 351
 Sections: Church I, 236-43, 295,
 298-9, 303-4
 Church II, 247-52, 299-300
 Church III, 253-61
 Ways of Worship, 263-75, 295,
 301-2
 Intercommunion, 275-86, 295,
 302-3
 Services: Opening Service, 83-93
 Conference Service, 288-94
 Closing Service, 316-19
 Lutheranism, 52, 55, 101, 107, 221, 222,
 275, 278, 281, 285, 291
- MESSAGE TO THE CHURCHES. *See* Word
 to the Churches.

- Method of Faith and Order movement,
101, 109ff., 156f., 166
- Methodism, 52, 101, 222, 278
- Ministry, 25ff., 34, 41f., 55, 57, 111,
116, 155, 168, 196, 255-6, 262,
266, 274, 275, 279
- Mission of the Church, 16, 18, 19, 21,
24, 40, 50, 132, 170, 182, 196,
204-24, 254, 259, 273, 276, 306.
And see Evangelism.
- Mystery in worship, 42, 46, 47, 269,
270
- NATIONALISM, 62, 178f., 217
- Non-theological factors. *See* Social and
cultural factors.
- OECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE OF CON-
STANTINOPLE, 105, 123-6, 298
- Old Catholics, 52, 278, 285
- Ordinances. *See* Sacraments.
- Orthodox Churches, 49, 52, 55, 104f.,
108, 116, 119f., 123-6, 221f.,
275, 278, 285, 298
- Oxford Conference, 73, 158
- PENTECOSTALISTS, 46
- People of God, 17, 19, 23, 142f., 154,
160, 237-8
- Persecuted Churches, 32, 50, 63, 88-9,
153f., 157, 217, 242, 276
- Polish National Catholic Church in
U.S.A., 52
- Post-Lund Consultation, 101
- Prayer for the departed, 44
- Presbyterianism, 26, 52, 221, 222, 278
- Press at Lund Conference, 107, 108,
301, 309-10
- Priesthood. *See* Ministry.
- Proselytism, 31, 256
- Protestant and Catholic. *See* Catholic
and Protestant.
- RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, 21, 24, 28,
45, 239, 249, 269
- Recognition of other Churches, 32-3
- Reformation, 27, 28, 107, 117, 179,
191, 249, 271
- Reformed. *See* Presbyterianism.
- Rome, Church of, 63, 72, 106, 108,
171, 173, 220ff.
- Russia, Churches in, 104
- SACRAMENTS, 21, 31, 34, 40, 51, 111,
114, 116, 117f., 140, 155, 239,
248, 253, 265, 280
- Saints, communion of, 43
- Salvation Army, 222
- Schism, 27, 180, 247, 248f.
- Scriptures, 20, 31, 50, 62, 252
- Secularism, 29
- Social and cultural factors in church
divisions, 12-13, 28, 32, 35,
44ff., 50, 62-3, 136, 164, 174-
203, 211, 228, 232, 242, 246,
249, 256-7, 258, 263-4, 267-70,
296
meeting at Bossey on, 13, 77-8, 297
Report on, 32, 103, 261-2, 297
- South India, Church of, 52, 54, 213f.,
278, 281
- Spirit, Holy, 20, 23, 25, 30, 34, 41,
60, 172, 238, 244, 246, 248,
253, 266, 298-9
- Student Christian Movement, 48
- Sweden, Church of, 107, 144, 187,
287, 314
- TORONTO STATEMENT, *Church, the
Churches and the W.C.C.*, 64,
136, 159, 164, 281
- Tradition and Scripture, 155, 252
- Trans-confessional differences and
agreements, 56, 62, 76, 155,
166, 193, 228, 241, 280
- Trinity, 39, 118
- UNITY OF THE CHURCH, CONCEPTIONS
OF, 18, 23ff., 30f., 34, 37-8,
115f., 118ff., 130, 133ff., 158f.,
169-70, 182f., 191f., 200, 201,
202, 207-8, 221f., 253-61, 297
- Unity schemes, 13, 28, 50, 86, 100f.,
207, 211-14, 220, 225, 276, 300,
310-11
- Utrecht Conference, 69, 73, 99

- Vestigia ecclesiae*, 29, 250
 Virgin Mary, 43, 267
- WAYS OF WORSHIP, 39ff.
 Report and volume on, 11, 43
 Theological Commission on, 39, 70, 78, 102, 111f., 171-2, 274
 Weeks of Prayer, 37, 72, 171, 220, 260, 271, 300
 Word of God, 21, 23, 34, 40, 50, 75, 111, 179, 201, 239, 253, 265, 273
 Word to the Churches, 15-16, 128, 137f., 300-1
 Working Committee of Faith and Order, 235, 302, 304f., 313
- World Council of Churches, 37, 49, 69, 99, 127, 227, 276
 Central Committee of, 37, 75, 76, 77, 100, 118, 136-7, 226, 231, 304
 Committee on Structure and Functioning of, 235
 Provisional Committee of, 70, 72, 99, 205, 206
 Worship, archaism in, 45-6
- YOUNGER CHURCHES, 36, 63-4, 85, 104, 106, 131, 157, 209-14, 217, 220f., 233, 243, 257, 259, 296, 300, 307
 Statement by members of, 310-11
 Youth group at Lund, 100, 106, 305-9
 Youth rally, 287

WCC Library
Ecumenical Institute
Château de Bossey
Ch. Chenevière 2
CH-1279 Begis-Bossey

ES

WCC GENEVA



1071542967